NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCLXXVIII.

MAY, 1888.

COLONEL INGERSOLL ON CHRISTIANITY.*

SOME REMARKS ON HIS REPLY TO DR. FIELD.

As a listener from across the broad Atlantic to the clash of arms in the combat between Colonel Ingersoll and Dr. Field on the most momentous of all subjects, I have not the personal knowledge which assisted these doughty champions in making reciprocal acknowledgments, as broad as could be desired, with reference to personal character and motive. Such acknowledgments are of high value in keeping the issue clear, if not always of all adventitious, yet of all venomous matter. Destitute of the experience on which to found them as original testimonies, still, in attempting partially to criticise the remarkable Reply of Colonel Ingersoll, I can both accept in good faith what has been said by Dr. Field, and add that it seems to me consonant with the strain of the pages I have set before me. Having said this, I shall allow myself the utmost freedom in remarks, which will be addressed exclusively to the matter, not the man.

Let me begin by making several acknowledgments of another kind, but which I feel to be serious. The Christian Church has lived long enough in external triumph and prosperity to expose those of whom it is composed to all such perils of error and mis-

* This article is copyrighted, and all rights are reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feasance, as triumph and prosperity bring with them. Belief in divine guidance is not of necessity belief that such guidance can never be frustrated by the laxity, the infirmity, the perversity of man, alike in the domain of action and in the domain of thought. Believers in the perpetuity of the life of the Church are not tied to believing in the perpetual health of the Church. Even the great Latin Communion, and that Communion even since the Council of the Vatican in 1870, theoretically admits, or does not exclude, the possibility of a wide range of local and partial error in opinion as well as conduct. Elsewhere the admission would be more unequivocal. Of such errors in tenet, or in temper and feeling more or less hardened into tenet, there has been a crop alike abundant and multifarious. Each Christian party is sufficiently apt to recognize this fact with regard to every other Christian party; and the more impartial and reflective minds are aware that no party is exempt from mischiefs, which lie at the root of the human constitution in its warped, impaired, and dislocated condition. Naturally enough, these deformities help to indispose men towards belief; and when this indisposition has been developed into a system of negative warfare, all the faults of all the Christian bodies, and sub-divisions of bodies, are, as it was natural to expect they would be, carefully raked together, and become part and parcel of the indictment against the divine scheme of redemption. I notice these things in the mass, without particularity, which might be invidious, for two important purposes. First, that we all, who hold by the Gospel and the Christian Church, may learn humility and modesty, as well as charity and indulgence, in the treatment of opponents, from our consciousness that we all, alike by our exaggerations and our shortcomings in belief, no less than by faults of conduct, have contributed to bring about this condition of fashionable hostility to religious faith: and, secondly, that we may resolutely decline to be held bound to tenets, or to consequences of tenets, which represent not the great Christendom of the past and present, but only some hole and corner of its vast organization; and not the heavenly treasure, but the rust or the canker to which that treasure has been exposed through the incidents of its custody in earthen vessels.

I do not remember ever to have read a composition, in which the merely local coloring of particular, and even very limited sec-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions of Christianity, was more systematically used as if it had been available and legitimate argument against the whole, than in the Reply before us. Colonel Ingersoll writes with a rare and enviable brilliancy, but also with an impetus which he seems unable to control. Denunciation, sarcasm, and invective, may in consequence be said to constitute the staple of his work; and, if argument or some favorable admission here and there peeps out for a moment, the writer soon leaves the dry and barren heights for his favorite and more luxurious galloping grounds beneath. Thus, when the Reply has consecrated a line (N. A. R., No. 372, p. 473) to the pleasing contemplation of his opponent as "manly, candid, and generous," it immediately devotes more than twelve to a declamatory denunciation of a practice (as if it were his) altogether contrary to generosity and to candor, and reproaches those who expect (*ibid.*) "to receive as alms an eternity of joy." I take this as a specimen of the mode of statement which permeates the whole Reply. It is not the statement of an untruth. The Christian receives as alms all whatsoever he receives at all. *Qui salvandos salvas gratis* is his song of thankful praise. But it is the statement of one-half of a truth, which lives only in its entirety, and of which the Reply gives us only a mangled and bleeding *frustum*. For the gospel teaches that the faith which saves is a living and energizing faith, and that the most precious part of the alms which we receive lies in an ethical and spiritual process, which partly qualifies for, but also and emphatically composes, this conferred eternity of joy. Restore this ethical element to the doctrine from which the Reply has rudely displaced it, and the whole force of the assault is gone, for there is now a total absence of point in the accusation; it comes only to this, that "mercy and judgment are met together," and that "righteousness and peace have kissed each other" (Ps. lxxxv. 10).

Perhaps, as we proceed, there will be supplied ampler means of judging whether I am warranted in saying that the instance I have here given is a normal instance of a practice so largely followed as to divest the entire Reply of that calmness and sobriety of movement which are essential to the just exercise of the reasoning power in subject matter not only grave, but solemn. Pascal has supplied us, in the "Provincial Letters," with an unique example of easy, brilliant, and fascinating treatment of a theme both profound and complex. But where shall we find another

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pascal? And, if we had found him, he would be entitled to point out to us that the famous work was not less close and logical than it was witty. In this case, all attempt at continuous argument appears to be deliberately abjured, not only as to pages, but, as may almost be said, even as to lines. The paper, noteworthy as it is, leaves on my mind the impression of a battle-field where every man strikes at every man, and all is noise, hurry, and confusion. Better surely had it been, and worthier of the great weight and elevation of the subject, if the controversy had been waged after the pattern of those engagements where a chosen champion on either side, in a space carefully limited and reserved, does battle on behalf of each silent and expectant host. The promiscuous crowds represent all the lower elements which enter into human conflicts: the chosen champions, and the order of their proceeding, signify the dominion of reason over force, and its just place as the sovereign arbiter of the great questions that involve the main destiny of man.

I will give another instance of the tumultuous method in which the Reply conducts, not, indeed, its argument, but its case. Dr. Field had exhibited an example of what he thought superstition, and had drawn a distinction between superstition and religion. But to the author of the Reply all religion is superstition, and, accordingly, he writes as follows (p. 475):

"You are shocked at the Hindoo mother, when she gives her child to death at the supposed command of her God. What do you think of Abraham? of Jephthah? What is your opinion of Jehovah himself?"

Taking these three appeals in the reverse order to that in which they are written, I will briefly ask, as to the closing challenge, "What do you think of Jehovah himself?" whether this is the tone in which controversy ought to be carried on? Not only is the name of Jehovah encircled in the heart of every believer with the profoundest reverence and love, but the Christian religion teaches, through the Incarnation, a doctrine of personal union with God so lofty that it can only be approached in a deep, reverential calm. I do not deny that a person who deems a given religion to be wicked may be led onward by logical consistency to impugn in strong terms the character of the Author and Object of that religion. But he is surely bound by the laws of social morality and decency to consider well the terms and the manner of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his indictment. If he founds it upon allegations of fact, these allegations should be carefully stated, so as to give his antagonists reasonable evidence that it is truth and not temper which wrings from him a sentence of condemnation, delivered in sobriety and sadness, and not without a due commiseration for those, whom he is attempting to undeceive, who think he is himself both deceived and a deceiver, but who surely are entitled, while this question is in process of decision, to require that He whom they adore should at least be treated with those decent reserves which are deemed essential when a human being, say a parent, wife, or sister, is in question. But here a contemptuous reference to Jehovah follows, not upon a careful investigation of the cases of Abraham and of Jephthah, but upon a mere summary citation of them to surrender themselves, so to speak, as culprits; that is to say, a summons to accept at once, on the authority of the Reply, the view which the writer is pleased to take of those cases. It is true that he assures us in another part of his paper that he has read the Scriptures with care; and I feel bound to accept this assurance, but at the same time to add that if it had not been given I should, for one, not have made the discovery, but might have supposed that the author had galloped, not through, but about, the sacred volume, as a man glances over the pages of an ordinary newspaper or novel.

Although there is no argument as to Abraham or Jephthah expressed upon the surface, we must assume that one is intended, and it seems to be of the following kind: "You are not entitled to reprove the Hindoo mother who cast her child under the wheels of the car of Juggernaut, for you approve of the conduct of Jephthah, who (probably) sacrificed his daughter in fulfilment of a vow (Judges xi. 31) that he would make a burnt offering of whatsoever, on his safe return, he should meet coming forth from the doors of his dwelling." Now the whole force of this rejoinder depends upon our supposed obligation as believers to approve the conduct of Jephthah. It is, therefore, a very serious question whether we are or are not so obliged. But this question the Reply does not condescend either to argue, or even to state. It jumps to an extreme conclusion without the decency of an intermediate step. Are not such methods of proceeding more suited to placards at an election, than to disquisitions on these most solemn subjects?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I am aware of no reason why any believer in Christianity should not be free to canvass, regret, condemn the act of Jephthah. So far as the narration which details it is concerned, there is not a word of sanction given to it more than to the falsehood of Abraham in Egypt, or of Jacob and Rebecca in the matter of the hunting (Gen. xx. 1–18, and Gen. xxiii.); or to the dissembling of Saint Peter in the case of the Judaizing converts (Gal. ii. 11). I am aware of no color of approval given to it elsewhere. But possibly the author of the Reply may have thought he found such an approval in the famous eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the apostle, handling his subject with a discernment and care very different from those of the Reply, writes thus (Heb. xi. 32):

"And what shall I say more? For the time would fail me to tell of Gideon, and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthah: of David also, and Samuel, and of the prophets."

Jephthah, then, is distinctly held up to us by a canonical writer as an object of praise. But of praise on what account? Why should the Reply assume that it is on account of the sacrifice of his child? The writer of the Reply has given us no reason, and no rag of a reason, in support of such a proposition. But this was the very thing he was bound by every consideration to prove, upon making his indictment against the Almighty. In my opinion, he could have one reason only for not giving a reason, and that was that no reason could be found.

The matter, however, is so full of interest, as illustrating both the method of the Reply and that of the Apostolic writer, that I shall enter farther into it, and draw attention to the very remarkable structure of this noble chapter, which is to Faith what the thirteenth of Cor. I. is to Charity. From the first to the thirty-first verse, it commemorates the achievements of faith in ten persons: Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses (in greater detail than any one else), and finally Rahab, in whom, I observe in passing, it will hardly be pretended that she appears in this list on account of the profession she had pursued. Then comes the rapid recital (v. 31), without any specification of particulars whatever, of these four names: Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah. Next follows a kind of recommencement, indicated by the word *also;* and the glorious acts and sufferings of the prophets are set forth largely, with a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

singular power and warmth, headed by the names of David and Samuel, the rest of the sacred band being mentioned only in the mass.

Now, it is surely very remarkable that, in the whole of this recital, the Apostle, whose "feet were shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace," seems with a tender instinct to avoid anything like stress on the exploits of warriors. Of the twelve persons having a share in the detailed expositions, David is the only warrior, and his character as a man of war is eclipsed by his greater attributes as a prophet, or declarer of the Divine counsels. It is yet more noteworthy that Joshua, who had so fair a fame, but who was only a warrior, is never named in the chapter, and we are simply told that "by faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they had been compassed about seven times" (Hebrews xi. 30). But the series of four names, which are given without any specification of their title to appear in the list, are all names of distinguished warriors. They had all done great acts of faith and patriotism against the enemies of Israel,—Gideon against the Midianites, Barak against the hosts of Syria, Samson against the Philistines, and Jephthah against the children of Ammon. Their title to appear in the list at all is in their acts of war, and the mode of their treatment as men of war is in striking accordance with the analogies of the chapter. All of them had committed errors. Gideon had again and again demanded a sign, and had made a golden ephod, "which thing became a snare unto Gideon and to his house" (Judges viii. 27). Barak had refused to go up against Jabin unless Deborah would join the venture (Judges v. 8). Samson had been in dalliance with Delilah. Last came Jephthah, who had, as we assume, sacrificed his daughter in fulfilment of a rash vow. No one supposes that any of the others are honored by mention in the chapter on account of his sin or error: why should that supposition be made in the case of Jephthah, at the cost of all the rules of orderly interpretation?

Having now answered the challenge as to Jephthah, I proceed to the case of Abraham. It would not be fair to shrink from touching it in its tenderest point. That point is nowhere expressly touched by the commendations bestowed upon Abraham in Scripture. I speak now of the special form, of the words that are employed. He is not commended because, being a father, he made all the preparations antecedent to plunging the knife into his son.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He is commended (as I read the text) because, having received a glorious promise, a promise that his wife should be a mother of nations, and that kings should be born of her (Gen. xvii. 6), and that by his seed the blessings of redemption should be conveyed to man, and the fulfilment of this promise depending solely upon the life of Isaac, he was, nevertheless, willing that the chain of these promises should be broken by the extinction of that life, because his faith assured him that the Almighty would find the way to give effect to His own designs (Heb. xi. 17–19). The offering of Isaac is mentioned as a completed offering, and the intended blood-shedding, of which I shall speak presently, is not here brought into view.

The facts, however, which we have before us, and which are treated in Scripture with caution, are grave and startling. A father is commanded to sacrifice his son. Before consummation, the sacrifice is interrupted. Yet the intention of obedience had been formed, and certified by a series of acts. It may have been qualified by a reserve of hope that God would interpose before the final act, but of this we have no distinct statement, and it can only stand as an allowable conjecture. It may be conceded that the narrative does not supply us with a complete statement of particulars. That being so, it behoves us to tread cautiously in approaching it. Thus much, however, I think, may further be said: the command was addressed to Abraham under conditions essentially different from those which now determine for us the limits of moral obligation.

For the conditions, both socially and otherwise, were indeed very different. The estimate of human life at the time was different. The position of the father in the family was different: its members were regarded as in some sense his property. There is every reason to suppose that, around Abraham in "the land of Moriah," the practice of human sacrifice as an act of religion was in vigor. But we may look more deeply into the matter. According to the Book of Genesis, Adam and Eve were placed under a law, not of consciously perceived right and wrong, but of simple obedience. The tree, of which alone they were forbidden to eat, was the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Duty lay for them in following the command of the Most High, before and until they, or their descendants, should become capable of appreciating it by an ethical standard. Their condition

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was greatly analogous to that of the infant, who has just reached the stage at which he can comprehend that he is ordered to do this or that, but not the nature of the thing so ordered. To the external standard of right and wrong, and to the obligation it entails *per se*, the child is introduced by a process gradually unfolded with the development of his nature, and the opening out of what we term a moral sense. If we pass at once from the epoch of Paradise to the period of the prophets, we perceive the important progress that has been made in the education of the race. The Almighty, in His mediate intercourse with Israel, deigns to appeal to an independently conceived criterion, as to an arbiter between His people and Himself. "Come, now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord" (Isaiah i. 18). "Yet ye say the way of the Lord is not equal. Hear now, O house of Israel, is not my way equal, are not your ways unequal?" (Ezekiel xvii. 25). Between these two epochs how wide a space of moral teaching has been traversed! But Abraham, so far as we may judge from the pages of Scripture, belongs essentially to the Adamic period, far more than to the prophetic. The notion of righteousness and sin was not indeed hidden from him: transgression itself had opened that chapter, and it was never to be closed: but as yet they lay wrapped up, so to speak, in Divine command and prohibition. And what God commanded, it was for Abraham to believe that He himself would adjust to the harmony of His own character.

The faith of Abraham, with respect to this supreme trial, appears to have been centred in this, that he would trust God to all extremities, and in despite of all appearances. The command received was obviously inconsistent with the promises which had preceded it. It was also inconsistent with the morality acknowledged in later times, and perhaps too definitely reflected in our minds, by an anachronism easy to conceive, on the day of Abraham. There can be little doubt, as between these two points of view, that the strain upon his faith was felt mainly, to say the least, in connection with the first mentioned. This faith is not wholly unlike the faith of Job; for Job believed, in despite of what was to the eye of flesh an unrighteous government of the world. If we may still trust the Authorized Version, his cry was, "though he slay me, yet will I trust in him" (Job xiii. 15). This cry was, however, the expression of one who did not expect to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

slain; and it may be that Abraham, when he said, "My son, God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt offering," not only believed explicity that God would do what was right, but, moreover, believed implicitly that a way of rescue would be found for his son. I do not say that this case is like the case of Jephthah, where the introduction of difficulty is only gratuitous. I confine myself to these propositions. Though the law of moral action is the same everywhere and always, it is variously applicable to the human being, as we know from experience, in the various stages of his development; and its first form is that of simple obedience to a superior whom there is every ground to trust. And further, if the few straggling rays of our knowledge in a case of this kind rather exhibit a darkness lying around us than dispel it, we do not even know all that was in the mind of Abraham, and are not in a condition to pronounce upon it, and cannot, without departure from sound reason, abandon that anchorage by which he probably held, that the law of Nature was safe in the hands of the Author of Nature, though the means of the reconciliation between the law and the appearances have not been fully placed within our reach.

But the Reply is not entitled to so wide an answer as that which I have given. In the parallel with the case of the Hindoo widow, it sins against first principles. An established and habitual practice of child-slaughter, in a country of an old and learned civilization, presents to us a case totally different from the issue of a command which was not designed to be obeyed and which belongs to a period when the years of manhood were associated in great part with the character that appertains to childhood.

It will already have been seen that the method of this Reply is not to argue seriously from point to point, but to set out in masses, without the labor of proof, crowds of imputations, which may overwhelm an opponent like balls from a *mitrailleuse*. As the charges lightly run over in a line or two require pages for exhibition and confutation, an exhaustive answer to the Reply within the just limits of an article is on this account out of the question; and the only proper course left open seems to be to make a selection of what appears to be the favorite, or the most formidable and telling, assertions, and to deal with these in the serious way which the grave interests of the theme, not the manner of their presentation, may deserve.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was an observation of Aristotle that weight attaches to the undemonstrated propositions of those who are able to speak in any given subject matter from experience. The Reply abounds in undemonstrated propositions. They appear, however, to be delivered without any sense of a necessity that either experience or reasoning are required in order to give them a title to acceptance. Thus, for example, the system of Mr. Darwin is hurled against Christianity as a dart which cannot but be fatal (p. 475):

"His discoveries, carried to their legitimate conclusion, destroy the creeds and sacred scriptures of mankind."

This wide-sweeping proposition is imposed upon us with no exposition of the how or the why; and the whole controversy of belief one might suppose is to be determined, as if from St. Petersburgh, by a series of *ukases*. It is only advanced, indeed, to decorate the introduction of Darwin's name in support of the proposition, which I certainly should support and not contest, that error and honesty are compatible.

On what ground, then, and for what reason, is the system of Darwin fatal to scriptures and to creeds? I do not enter into the question whether it has passed from the stage of working hypothesis into that of demonstration, but I assume, for the purposes of the argument, all that, in this respect, the Reply can desire.

It is not possible to discover, from the random language of the Reply, whether the scheme of Darwin is to sweep away all theism, or is to be content with extinguishing revealed religion. If the latter is meant, I should reply that the moral history of man, in its principal stream, has been distinctly an evolution from the first until now; and that the succinct though grand account of the Creation in Genesis is singularly accordant with the same idea, but is wider than Darwinism, since it includes in the grand progression the inanimate world as well as the history of organisms. But, as this could not be shown without much detail, the Reply reduces me to the necessity of following its own unsatisfactory example in the bald form of an assertion, that there is no colorable ground for assuming evolution and revelation to be at variance with one another.

If, however, the meaning be that theism is swept away by Darwinism, I observe that, as before, we have only an unreasoned dogma or dictum to deal with, and, dealing perforce with the unknown, we are in danger of striking at a will of the wisp. Still,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I venture on remarking that the doctrine of Evolution has acquired both praise and dispraise which it does not deserve. It is lauded in the skeptical camp because it is supposed to get rid of the shocking idea of what are termed sudden acts of creation; and it is as unjustly dispraised, on the opposing side, because it is thought to bridge over the gap between man and the inferior animals, and to give emphasis to the relationship between them. But long before the day either of Mr. Darwin or his grandfather, Dr. Erasmus Darwin, this relationship had been stated, perhaps even more emphatically by one whom, were it not that I have small title to deal in undemonstrated assertion, I should venture to call the most cautious, the most robust, and the most comprehensive of our philosophers. Suppose, says Bishop Butler (Analogy, Part 2, Chapt. 2), that it were implied in the natural immortality of brutes, that they must arrive at great attainments, and become (like us) rational and moral agents; even this would be no difficulty, since we know not what latent powers and capacities they may be endowed with. And if pride causes us to deem it an indignity that our race should have proceeded by propagation from an ascending scale of inferior organisms, why should it be a more repulsive idea to have sprung immediately from something less than man in brain and body, than to have been fashioned according to the expression in Genesis (Chap. II., v. 7) "out of the dust of the ground"? There are halls and galleries of introduction in a palace, but none in a cottage; and this arrival of the creative work at its climax through an ever aspiring preparatory series, rather than by transition at a step from the inanimate mould of earth, may tend rather to magnify than to lower the creation of man on its physical side. But if belief has (as commonly) been premature in its alarms, has non-belief been more reflective in its exulting anticipations, and its pæans on the assumed disappearance of what are strangely enough termed sudden acts of creation from the sphere of our study and contemplation?

One striking effect of the Darwinian theory of descent is, so far as I understand, to reduce the breadth of all intermediate distinctions in the scale of animated life. It does not bring all creatures into a single lineage, but all diversities are to be traced back, at some point in the scale and by stages indefinitely minute, to a common ancestry. All is done by steps, nothing by strides, leaps, or bounds; all from protoplasm up to Shakespeare, and,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

again, all from primal night and chaos up to protoplasm. I do not ask, and am incompetent to judge, whether this is among the things proven, but I take it so for the sake of the argument; and I ask, first, why and whereby does this doctrine eliminate the idea of creation? Does the new philosophy teach that if the passage from pure reptile to pure bird is achieved by a spring (so to speak) over a chasm, this implies and requires creation; but that if reptile passes into bird, and rudimental into finished bird, by a thousand slight and but just discernible modifications, each one of these is so small that they are not entitled to a name so lofty, may be set down to any cause or no cause, as we please? I should have supposed it miserably unphilosophical to treat the distinction between creative and non-creative function as a simply quantitative distinction. As respects the subjective effect on the human mind, creation in small, when closely regarded, awakens reason to admiring wonder, not less than creation in great: and as regards that function itself, to me it appears no less than ridiculous to hold that the broadly outlined and large advances of so-called Mosaism are creation, but the refined and stealthy onward steps of Darwinism are only manufacture, and relegate the question of a cause into obscurity, insignificance, or oblivion.

But does not reason really require us to go farther, to turn the tables on the adversary, and to contend that evolution, by how much it binds more closely together the myriad ranks of the living, aye, and of all other orders, by so much the more consolidates, enlarges, and enhances the true argument of design, and the entire theistic position? If orders are not mutually related, it is easier to conceive of them as sent at haphazard into the world. We may, indeed, sufficiently draw an argument of design from each separate structure, but we have no further title to build upon the position which each of them holds as towards any other. But when the connection between these objects has been established, and so established that the points of transition are almost as indiscernible as the passage from day to night, then, indeed, each preceding stage is a prophesy of the following, each succeeding one is a memorial of the past, and, throughout the immeasurable series, every single member of it is a witness to all the rest. The Reply ought surely to dispose of these, and probably many more arguments in the case, before assuming so absolutely the rights of dictatorship, and laying it down that Darwinism, carried to its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legitimate conclusion (and I have nowhere endeavored to cut short its career), destroys the creeds and scriptures of mankind. That I may be the more definite in my challenge, I would, with all respect, ask the author of the Reply to set about confuting the succinct and clear argument of his countryman, Mr. Fiske, who, in the earlier part of the small work entitled "Man's Destiny" (Macmillan, London, 1887) has given what seems to me an admissible and also striking interpretation of the leading Darwinian idea in its bearings on the theistic argument. To this very partial treatment of a great subject I must at present confine myself; and I proceed to another of the notions, as confident as they seem to be crude, which the Reply has drawn into its wide-casting net (p. 475):

"Why should God demand a sacrifice from man? Why should the Infinite ask anything from the finite? Should the sun beg of the glow-worm, and should the momentary spark excite the envy of the source of light?"

This is one of the cases in which happy or showy illustration is, in the Reply before me, set to carry with a rush the position which argument would have to approach more laboriously and more slowly. The case of the glow-worm with the sun cannot but move a reader's pity, it seems so very hard. But let us suppose for a moment that the glow-worm was so constituted, and so related to the sun that an interaction between them was a fundamental condition of its health and life; that the glow-worm must, by the law of its nature, like the moon, reflect upon the sun, according to its strength and measure, the light which it receives, and that only by a process involving that reflection its own store of vitality could be upheld? It will be said that this is a very large *petitio* to import into the glow-worm's case. Yes, but it is the very *petitio* which is absolutely requisite in order to make it parallel to the case of the Christian. The argument which the Reply has to destroy is and must be the Christian argument, and not some figure of straw, fabricated at will. It is needless, perhaps, but it is refreshing, to quote the noble Psalm (Ps. l. 10, 12, 14, 15), in which this assumption of the Reply is rebuked. "All the beasts of the forest are mine; and so are the cattle upon a thousand hills. . . . If I be hungry I will not tell thee; for the whole world is mine, and all that is therein. . . . Offer unto God thanksgiving; and pay thy vows

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unto the Most Highest, and call upon Me in the time of trouble; so will I hear thee, and thou shalt praise Me." Let me try my hand at a counter-illustration. If the Infinite is to make no demand upon the finite, by parity of reasoning the great and strong should scarcely make them on the weak and small. Why then should the father make demands of love, obedience, and sacrifice, from his young child? Is there not some flavor of the sun and glow-worm here? But every man does so make them, if he is a man of sense and feeling; and he makes them for the sake and in the interest of the son himself, whose nature, expanding in the warmth of affection and pious care, requires, by an inward law, to return as well as to receive. And so God asks of us, in order that what we give to Him may be far more our own than it ever was before the giving, or than it could have been unless first rendered up to Him, to become a part of what the gospel calls our treasure in heaven.

Although the Reply is not careful to supply us with *whys*, it does not hesitate to ask for them (p. 479):

"Why should an infinitely wise and powerful God destroy the good and preserve the vile? Why should He treat all alike here, and in another world make an infinite difference? Why should your God allow His worshipers, His adorers, to be destroyed by His enemies? Why should He allow the honest, the loving, the noble to perish at the stake?"

The upholders of belief or of revelation, from Claudian down to Cardinal Newman (see the very remarkable passage of the *Apologia pro vitâ suâ*, pp. 376–78), cannot and do not, seek to deny that the methods of divine government, as they are exhibited by experience, present to us many and varied moral problems, insoluble by our understanding. Their existence may not, and should not, be dissembled. But neither should they be exaggerated. Now exaggeration by mere suggestion is the fault, the glaring fault, of these queries. One who had no knowledge of mundane affairs beyond the conception they insinuate would assume that, as a rule, evil has the upper hand in the management of the world. Is this the grave philosophical conclusion of a careful observer, or is it a crude, hasty, and careless overstatement?

It is not difficult to conceive how, in times of sadness and of storm, when the suffering soul can discern no light at any point of the horizon, place is found for such an idea of life. It is, of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

course, opposed to the Apostolic declaration that godliness hath the promise of the life that now is (1 Tim. iv. 8), but I am not to expect such a declaration to be accepted as current coin, even of the meanest value, by the author of the Reply. Yet I will offer two observations founded on experience in support of it, one taken from a limited, another from a larger and more open sphere. John Wesley, in the full prime of his mission, warned the converts whom he was making among English laborers of a spiritual danger that lay far ahead. It was that, becoming godly, they would become careful, and, becoming careful, they would become wealthy. It was a just and sober forecast, and it represented with truth the general rule of life, although it be a rule perplexed with exceptions. But, if this be too narrow a sphere of observation, let us take a wider one, the widest of all. It is comprised in the brief statement that Christendom rules the world, and rules it, perhaps it should be added, by the possession of a vast surplus of material as well as moral force. Therefore the assertions carried by implication in the queries of the Reply, which are general, are because general untrue, although they might have been true within those prudent limitations which the method of this Reply appears especially to eschew.

Taking, then, these challenges as they ought to have been given, I admit that great believers, who have been also great masters of wisdom and knowledge, are not able to explain the inequalities of adjustment between human beings and the conditions in which they have been set down to work out their destiny. The climax of these inequalities is perhaps to be found in the fact that, whereas rational belief, viewed at large, founds the Providential government of the world upon the hypothesis of free agency, there are so many cases in which the overbearing mastery of circumstance appears to reduce it to extinction or paralysis. Now, in one sense, without doubt, these difficulties are matter for our legitimate and necessary cognizance. It is a duty incumbent upon us respectively, according to our means and opportunities, to decide for ourselves, by the use of the faculty of reason given us, the great questions of natural and revealed religion. They are to be decided according to the evidence; and, if we cannot trim the evidence into a consistent whole, then according to the balance of the evidence. We are not entitled, either for or against belief, to set up in this province any rule of investiga-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, except such as common-sense teaches us to use in the ordinary conduct of life. As in ordinary conduct, so in considering the basis of belief, we are bound to look at the evidence as a whole. We have no right to demand demonstrative proofs, or the removal of all conflicting elements, either in the one sphere or in the other. What guides us sufficiently in matters of common practice has the very same authority to guide us in matters of speculation; more properly, perhaps, to be called the practice of the soul. If the evidence in the aggregate shows the being of a moral Governor of the world, with the same force as would suffice to establish an obligation to act in a matter of common conduct, we are bound in duty to accept it, and have no right to demand as a condition previous that all occasions of doubt or question be removed out of the way. Our demands for evidence must be limited by the general reason of the case. Does that general reason of the case make it probable that a finite being, with a finite place in a comprehensive scheme, devised and administered by a Being who is infinite, would be able either to embrace within his view, or rightly to appreciate, all the motives and the aims that may have been in the mind of the Divine Disposer? On the contrary, a demand so unreasonable deserves to be met with the scornful challenge of Dante (Paradise xix. 79):

> Or tu chi sei, che vuoi sedere a scranna
> Per giudicar da lungi mille miglia
> Colla veduta corta d'una spanna?

Undoubtedly a great deal here depends upon the question whether, and in what degree, our knowledge is limited. And here the Reply seems to be by no means in accord with Newton and with Butler. By its contempt for authority, the Reply seems to cut off from us all knowledge that is not at first hand; but then also it seems to assume an original and first hand knowledge of all possible kinds of things. I will take an instance, all the easier to deal with because it is outside the immediate sphere of controversy. In one of those pieces of fine writing with which the Reply abounds, it is determined *obiter* by a backhanded stroke (N. A. R., p. 491) that Shakespeare is "by far the greatest of the human race." I do not feel entitled to assert that he is not; but how vast and complex a question is here determined for us in this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

airy manner! Has the writer of the Reply really weighed the force, and measured the sweep of his own words? Whether Shakespeare has or has not the primacy of genius over a very few other names which might be placed in competition with his, is a question which has not yet been determined by the general or deliberate judgment of lettered mankind. But behind it lies another question, inexpressibly difficult, except for the Reply, to solve. That question is, what is the relation of human genius to human greatness. Is genius the sole constitutive element of greatness, or with what other elements, and in what relations to them, is it combined? Is every man great in proportion to his genius? Was Goldsmith, or was Sheridan, or was Burns, or was Byron, or was Goethe, or was Napoleon, or was Alcibiades, no smaller, and was Johnson, or was Howard, or was Washington, or was Phocion or Leonidas no greater, than in proportion to his genius properly so called? How are we to find a common measure, again, for different kinds of greatness; how weigh, for example, Dante against Julius Cæsar? And I am speaking of greatness properly so called, not of goodness properly so called. We might seem to be dealing with a writer whose contempt for authority in general is fully balanced, perhaps outweighed, by his respect for one authority in particular.

The religions of the world, again, have in many cases given to many men material for life-long study. The study of the Christian Scriptures, to say nothing of Christian life and institutions, has been to many and justly famous men a study "never ending, still beginning"; not, like the world of Alexander, too limited for the powerful faculty that ranged over it; but, on the contrary, opening height on height, and with deep answering to deep, and with increase of fruit ever prescribing increase of effort. But the Reply has sounded all these depths, has found them very shallow, and is quite able to point out (p. 490) the way in which the Saviour of the world might have been a much greater teacher than He actually was; had He said anything, for instance, of the family relation, had He spoken against slavery and tyranny, had He issued a sort of *code Napoleon* embracing education, progress, scientific truth, and international law. This observation on the family relation seems to me beyond even the usual measure of extravagance when we bear in mind that, according to the Christian scheme, the Lord of heaven and earth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"was subject" (St. Luke ii. 51) to a human mother and a reputed human father, and that He taught (according to the widest and, I believe, the best opinion) the absolute indissolubility of marriage. I might cite many other instances in reply. But the broader and the true answer to the objection is, that the Gospel was promulgated to teach principles and not a code; that it included the foundation of a society in which those principles were to be conserved, developed, and applied; and that down to this day there is not a moral question of all those which the Reply does or does not enumerate, nor is there a question of duty arising in the course of life for any of us, that is not determinable in all its essentials by applying to it as a touchstone the principles declared in the Gospel. Is not, then, the *hiatus*, which the Reply has discovered in the teaching of our Lord, an imaginary *hiatus?* Nay, are the suggested improvements of that teaching really gross deteriorations? Where would have been the wisdom of delivering to an uninstructed population of a particular age a codified religion, which was to serve for all nations, all ages, all states of civilization? Why was not room to be left for the career of human thought in finding out, and in working out, the adaptation of Christianity to the ever varying movement of the world? And how is it that they who will not admit that a revelation is in place when it has in view the great and necessary work of conflict against sin, are so free in recommending enlargements of that Revelation for purposes, as to which no such necessity can be pleaded?

I have known a person who, after studying the old classical or Olympian religion for the third part of a century, at length began to hope that he had some partial comprehension of it, some inkling of what it meant. Woe is him that he was not conversant either with the faculties or with the methods of the Reply, which apparently can dispose in half an hour of any problem, dogmatic, historical, or moral; and which accordingly takes occasion to assure us that Buddha was "in many respects the greatest religious teacher this world has ever known, the broadest, the most intellectual of them all" (p. 491). On this I shall only say that an attempt to bring Buddha and Buddhism into line together is far beyond my reach, but that every Christian, knowing in some degree what Christ is, and what He has done for the world, can only be the more thankful if Buddha, or Confucius, or any other teacher

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has in any point, and in any measure, come near to the outskirts of His ineffable greatness and glory.

It is my fault or my misfortune to remark, in this Reply, an inaccuracy of reference, which would of itself suffice to render it remarkable. Christ, we are told (pp. 492, 500), denounced the chosen people of God as "a generation of vipers." This phrase is applied by the Baptist to the crowd who came to seek baptism from him; but it is only applied by our Lord to Scribes or Pharisees (Luke iii. 7, Matthew xxiii. 33, and xii. 34), who are so commonly placed by Him in contrast with the people. The error is repeated in the mention of whited sepulchres. Take again the version of the story of Ananias and Sapphira. We are told (p. 494) that the Apostles conceived the idea "of having all things in common." In the narrative there is no statement, no suggestion of the kind; it is a pure interpolation (Acts iv. 32–7). Motives of a reasonable prudence are stated as matter of fact to have influenced the offending couple—another pure interpolation. After the catastrophe of Ananias "the Apostles sent for his wife"—a third interpolation. I refer only to these points as exhibitions of an habitual and dangerous inaccuracy, and without any attempt at present to discuss the case, in which the judgments of God are exhibited on their severer side, and in which I cannot, like the Reply, undertake summarily to determine for what causes the Almighty should or should not take life, or delegate the power to take it.

Again, we have (p. 486) these words given as a quotation from the Bible:

"They who believe and are baptized shall be saved, and they who believe not shall be damned; and these shall go away into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

The second clause thus reads as if applicable to the persons mentioned in the first; that is to say, to those who reject the tidings of the Gospel. But instead of its being a continuous passage, the latter section is brought out of another gospel (St. Matthew's) and another connection; and it is really written, not of those who do not believe, but of those who refuse to perform offices of charity to their neighbour in his need. It would be wrong to call this intentional misrepresentation; but can it be called less than somewhat reckless negligence?

It is a more special misfortune to find a writer arguing on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same side with his critic, and yet for the critic not to be able to agree with him. But so it is with reference to the great subject of immortality, as treated in the Reply.

"The idea of immortality, that, like a sea, has ebbed and flowed in the human heart, with its countless waves of hope and fear beating against the shores and rocks of time and fate, was not born of any book, nor of any creed, nor of any religion. It was born of human affection; and it will continue to ebb and flow beneath the mist and clouds of doubt and darkness, as long as love kisses the lips of death" (p. 483).

Here we have a very interesting chapter of the history of human opinion disposed of in the usual summary way, by a statement which, as it appears to me, is developed out of the writer's inner consciousness. If the belief in immortality is not connected with any revelation or religion, but is simply the expression of a subjective want, then plainly we may expect the expression of it to be strong and clear in proportion to the various degrees in which faculty is developed among the various races of mankind. But how does the matter stand historically? The Egyptians were not a people of high intellectual development, and yet their religious system was strictly associated with, I might rather say founded on, the belief in immortality. The ancient Greeks, on the other hand, were a race of astonishing, perhaps unrivalled, intellectual capacity. But not only did they, in prehistoric ages, derive their scheme of a future world from Egypt; we find also that, with the lapse of time and the advance of the Hellenic civilization, the constructive ideas of the system lost all life and definite outline, and the most powerful mind of the Greek philosophy, that of Aristotle, had no clear conception whatever of a personal existence in a future state.

The favorite doctrine of the Reply is the immunity of all error in belief from moral responsibility. In the first page (p. 473) this is stated with reserve as the "innocence of *honest* error." But why such a limitation? The Reply warms with its subject; it shows us that no error can be otherwise than honest, inasmuch as nothing which involves honesty, or its reverse, can, from the constitution of our nature, enter into the formation of opinion. Here is the full blown exposition (p. 476):

"The brain thinks without asking our consent. We believe, or we disbelieve, without an effort of the will. Belief is a result.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is the effect of evidence upon the mind. The scales turn in spite of him who watches. *There is no opportunity of being honest, or dishonest, in the formation of an opinion.* The conclusion is entirely independent of desire."

The reasoning faculty is, therefore, wholly extrinsic to our moral nature, and no influence is or can be received or imparted between them. I know not whether the meaning is that all the faculties of our nature are like so many separate departments in one of the modern shops that supply all human wants; that will, memory, imagination, affection, passion, each has its own separate domain, and that they meet only for a comparison of results, just to tell one another what they have severally been doing. It is difficult to conceive, if this be so, wherein consists the personality, or individuality, or organic unity of man. It is not difficult to see that while the Reply aims at uplifting human nature, it in reality plunges us (p. 475) into the abyss of degradation by the destruction of moral freedom, responsibility, and unity. For we are justly told that "reason is the supreme and final test." Action may be merely instinctive and habitual, or it may be consciously founded on formulated thought; but, in the cases where it is instinctive and habitual, it passes over, so soon as it is challenged, into the other category, and finds a basis for itself in some form of opinion. But, says the Reply, we have no responsibility for our opinions: we cannot help forming them according to the evidence as it presents itself to us. Observe, the doctrine embraces every kind of opinion, and embraces all alike, opinion on subjects where we like or dislike, as well as upon subjects where we merely affirm or deny in some medium absolutely colourless. For, if a distinction be taken between the colourless and the coloured medium, between conclusions to which passion or propensity or imagination inclines us, and conclusions to which these have nothing to say, then the whole ground will be cut away from under the feet of the Reply, and it will have to build again *ab initio*. Let us try this by a test case. A father who has believed his son to have been through life upright, suddenly finds that charges are made from various quarters against his integrity. Or a friend, greatly dependent for the work of his life on the co-operation of another friend, is told that that comrade is counterworking and betraying him. I make no assumption now as to the evidence or the result: but I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ask which of them could approach the investigation without feeling a desire to be able to acquit? And what shall we say of the desire to condemn? Would Elizabeth have had no leaning towards finding Mary Stuart implicated in a conspiracy? Did English judges and juries approach with an unbiassed mind the trials for the Popish plot? Were the opinions formed by the English Parliament on the Treaty of Limerick formed without the intervention of the will? Did Napoleon judge according to the evidence when he acquitted himself in the matter of the Duc d'Enghien? Does the intellect sit in a solitary chamber, like Galileo in the palace of the Vatican, and pursue celestial observation all untouched, while the turmoil of earthly business is raging everywhere around? According to the Reply, it must be a mistake to suppose that there is anywhere in the world such a thing as bias, or prejudice, or prepossession: they are words without meaning in regard to our judgments, for, even if they could raise a clamor from without, the intellect sits within, in an atmosphere of serenity, and, like Justice, is deaf and blind, as well as calm.

In addition to all other faults, I hold that this philosophy, or phantasm of philosophy, is eminently retrogressive. Human nature, in its compound of flesh and spirit, becomes more complex with the progress of civilization; with the steady multiplication of wants, and of means for their supply. With complication, introspection has largely extended, and I believe that, as observation extends its field, so far from isolating the intelligence and making it autocratic it tends more and more to enhance and multiply the infinitely subtle, as well as the broader and more palpable modes, in which the interaction of the human faculties is carried on. Who among us has not had occasion to observe, in the course of his experience, how largely the intellectual power of a man is affected by the demands of life on his moral powers, and how they open and grow, or dry up and dwindle, according to the manner in which those demands are met.

Genius itself, however purely a conception of the intellect, is not exempt from the strong influences of joy and suffering, love and hatred, hope and fear, in the development of its powers. It may be that Homer, Shakespeare, Goethe, basking upon the whole in the sunshine of life, drew little supplementary force from its trials and agitations. But the history of one not less wonderful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than any of these, the career of Dante, tells a different tale; and one of the latest and most searching investigators of his history (Scartazzini, Dante Alighieri, *seine zeit, sein leben, und seine werkes*, B. II. Ch. 5, p. 119; also pp. 438, 9. Biel, 1869) tells, and shows us, how the experience of his life co-operated with his extraordinary natural gifts and capabilities to make him what he was. Under the three great heads of love, belief, and patriotism, his life was a continued course of ecstatic or agonizing trials. The strain of these trials was discipline; discipline was experience; and experience was elevation. No reader of his greatest work will, I believe, hold with the Reply that his thoughts, conclusions, judgments were simple results of an automatic process, in which the will and affections had no share, that reasoning operations are like the whir of a clock running down, and we can no more arrest the process or alter the conclusion than the wheels can stop the movement or the noise.*

The doctrine taught in the Reply, that belief is, as a general, nay, universal, law, independent of the will, surely proves, when examined, to be a plausibility of the shallowest kind. Even in arithmetic, if a boy, through dislike of his employment, and consequent lack of attention, brings out a wrong result for his sum, it can hardly be said that his conclusion is absolutely and in all respects independent of his will. Moving onward, point by point, toward the centre of the argument, I will next take an illustration from mathematics. It has (I apprehend) been demonstrated that the relation of the diameter to the circumference of a circle is not susceptible of full numerical expression. Yet, from time to time, treatises are published which boldly announce that they set forth the quadrature of the circle. I do not deny that this may be purely intellectual error; but would it not, on the other hand, be hazardous to assert that no grain of egotism or ambition

* I possess the confession of an illiterate criminal, made, I think, in 1834, under the following circumstances: The new poor law had just been passed in England, and it required persons needing relief to go into the workhouse as a condition of receiving it. In some parts of the country, this provision produced a profound popular panic. The man in question was destitute at the time. He was (I think) an old widower with four very young sons. He rose in the night and strangled them all, one after another, with a blue handkerchief, not from want of fatherly affection, but to keep them out of the workhouse. The confession of this peasant, simple in phrase, but intensely impassioned strongly reminds me of the Ugolino of Dante, and appears to make some approach to its sublimity. Such, in given circumstances, is the effect of moral agony on mental power.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has ever entered into the composition of any one of such treatises? I have selected these instances as, perhaps, the most favorable that can be found to the doctrine of the Reply. But the truth is that, if we set aside matters of trivial import, the enormous majority of human judgments are those into which the biassing power of likes and dislikes more or less largely enters. I admit, indeed, that the illative faculty works under rules upon which choice and inclination ought to exercise no influence whatever. But even if it were granted that in fact the faculty of discourse is exempted from all such influence within its own province, yet we come no nearer to the mark, because that faculty has to work upon materials supplied to it by other faculties; it draws conclusions according to premises, and the question has to be determined whether our conceptions set forth in those premises are or are not influenced by moral causes. For, if they be so influenced, then in vain will be the proof that the understanding has dealt loyally and exactly with the materials it had to work upon; inasmuch as, although the intellectual process be normal in itself, the operation may have been tainted *ab initio* by colouring and distorting influences which have falsified the primary conceptions.

Let me now take an illustration from the extreme opposite quarter to that which I first drew upon. The system called Thuggism, represented in the practice of the Thugs, taught that the act, which we describe as murder, was innocent. Was this an honest error? Was it due, in its authors as well as in those who blindly followed them, to an automatic process of thought, in which the will was not consulted, and which accordingly could entail no responsibility? If it was, then it is plain that the whole foundations, not of belief, but of social morality, are broken up. If it was not, then the sweeping doctrine of the present writer on the necessary blamelessness of erroneous conclusions tumbles to the ground like a house of cards at the breath of the child who built it.

In truth, the pages of the Reply, and the Letter which has more recently followed it,* themselves demonstrate that what the writer has asserted wholesale he overthrows and denies in

* NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for January, 1888, "Another Letter to Dr. Field."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

detail. "You will admit," says the Reply (p. 477), "that he who now persecutes for opinion's sake is infamous." But why? Suppose he thinks that by persecution he can bring a man from soul-destroying falsehood to soul-saving truth, this opinion may reflect on his intellectual debility: but that is his misfortune, not his fault. His brain has thought without asking his consent; he has believed or disbelieved without an effort of the will (p. 476). Yet the very writer, who has thus established his title to think, is the first to hurl at him an anathema for thinking. And again, in the Letter to Dr. Field (N. A. R., vol. 146, p. 33), "the dogma of eternal pain" is described as "that infamy of infamies." I am not about to discuss the subject of future retribution. If I were, it would be my first duty to show that this writer has not adequately considered either the scope of his own arguments (which in no way solve the difficulties he presents) or the meaning of his words; and my second would be to recommend his perusal of what Bishop Butler has suggested on this head. But I am at present on ground altogether different. I am trying another issue. This author says we believe or disbelieve without the action of the will, and, consequently, belief or disbelief is not the proper subject of praise or blame. And yet, according to the very same authority, the dogma of eternal pain is what?—not "an error of errors," but an "infamy of infamies;" and though to hold a negative may not be a subject of moral reproach, yet to hold the affirmative may. Truly it may be asked, is not this a fountain which sends forth at once sweet waters and bitter?

Once more. I will pass away from tender ground, and will endeavor to lodge a broader appeal to the enlightened judgment of the author. Says Odysseus in the Iliad (B. II.) *οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη*: and a large part of the world, stretching this sentiment beyond its original meaning, have held that the root of civil power is not in the community, but in its head. In opposition to this doctrine, the American written Constitution, and the entire American tradition, teach the right of a nation to self-government. And these propositions, which have divided and still divide the world, open out respectively into vast systems of irreconcilable ideas and laws, practices and habits of mind. Will any rational man, above all will any American, contend that these conflicting systems have been adopted, upheld, and enforced on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one side and the other, in the daylight of pure reasoning only, and that moral, or immoral, causes have had nothing to do with their adoption? That the intellect has worked impartially, like a steam-engine, and that selfishness, love of fame, love of money, love of power, envy, wrath, and malice, or again bias, in its least noxious form, have never had anything to do with generating the opposing movements, or the frightful collisions in which they have resulted? If we say that they have not, we contradict the universal judgment of mankind. If we say they have, then mental processes are not automatic, but may be influenced by the will and by the passions, affections, habits, fancies, that sway the will; and this writer will not have advanced a step toward proving the universal innocence of error, until he has shown that propositions of religion are essentially unlike almost all other propositions, and that no man ever has been, or from the nature of the case can be, affected in their acceptance or rejection by moral causes.*

To sum up. There are many passages in these noteworthy papers, which, taken by themselves, are calculated to command warm sympathy. Towards the close of his final, or latest letter, the writer expresses himself as follows (N. A. R., vol. 146, p. 46):

"Neither in the interest of truth, nor for the benefit of man, is it necessary to assert what we do not know. No cause is great enough to demand a sacrifice of candor. The mysteries of life and death, of good and evil, have never yet been solved."

How good, how wise are these words! But coming at the close of the controversy, have they not some of the ineffectual features of a death-bed repentance? They can hardly be said to represent in all points the rules under which the pages preceding them have been composed; or he, who so justly says that we ought not to assert what we do not know, could hardly have laid down the law as we find it a few pages earlier (ibid, p. 40) when it is pronounced that "an infinite God has no excuse for leaving his children in doubt and darkness." Candor and upright inten-

*The chief part of these observations were written before I had received the January number of the REVIEW, with Col. Ingersoll's additional letter to Dr. Field. Much of this letter is specially pointed at Dr. Field, who can defend himself, and at Calvin, whose ideas I certainly cannot undertake to defend all along the line. I do not see that the Letter adds to those, the most salient, points of the earlier article which I have endeavored to select for animadversion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion are indeed every where manifest amidst the flashing coruscations which really compose the staple of the articles. Candor and upright intention also impose upon a commentator the duty of formulating his animadversions. I sum them up under two heads. Whereas we are placed in an atmosphere of mystery, relieved only by a little sphere of light round each of us, like a clearing in an American forest (which this writer has so well described), and rarely can see farther than is necessary for the direction of our own conduct from day to day, we find here, assumed by a particular person, the character of an universal judge without appeal. And whereas the highest self-restraint is necessary in these dark but, therefore, all the more exciting inquiries, in order to maintain the ever quivering balance of our faculties, this writer chooses to ride an unbroken horse, and to throw the reins upon his neck. I have endeavored to give a sample of the results.

W. E. GLADSTONE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DANGEROUS "TRUSTS."

We have entered upon a dangerous epoch in the evolution of our civilization, and hardly a fortnight passes now without developing some new combination of gigantic "trusts" of some corporate, industrial, or commercial interest, to fix the price to consumers of all sorts of things and commodities, independent of the economic operations of the law of supply and demand. One of the first, as well as one of the greatest combinations ever formed was the Standard Oil Company, and it has thus far been so eminently successfuly in absolutely controlling the market price of oil, regardless of consumers or producers, and in defiance of supposed well settled principles of political economy, that it has inevitably bred an ugly brood of imitators.

The next great combine was the whisky trust, commonly known as the whisky ring. This became so strong and potential that it commanded the submission, not only of States, but of the National Government, to its behests and interests. It insists upon a monopoly tax upon whisky, but generally pays the tax (if at all) only when it suits its own convenience. The people of this country have already become weary of hearing of trust conspiracies for the monopoly of beef, salt, gas, coal, oil, rubber, lead, lead pencils, copper, etc., indeed, almost everything which may be controlled by aggregated capital.

Perhaps one clear and concise statute forbidding corporations or aggregated capital to do business except as a unit would break up these pernicious trusts, which have been so serious a menace to commercial progress and to our future national prosperity. The introduction of such an enactment is imperatively demanded by the requirements of the situation. Otherwise all competition, the life of all trade, will be eventually crushed out. An economic writer of great force says: "The 'trusts' are, in effect, corporations created without the consent of the state, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not subject to the control exercised over legalized corporations. The combination of coal companies to sustain the prices of coal and to arbitrarily limit production is practically a 'trust' in the general scope of its operations. The steel-rail combination is of like character. And so with others. *The object of all these combinations is to effect an illegal purpose by legal means.* What is to be done with them? It is a well settled principle of law that associations have no more right to inflict injuries upon others than individuals have. But these associations merely agree verbally to quit selling their products until their price shall be offered them. The 'trusts' do not hesitate to undersell troublesome competitors or to overbid them for necessary raw material, thus making themselves, if successful, the only wholesale buyers and the only wholesale sellers of the commodities they deal in. After having established themselves by breaking down competition, they make the consumer pay the expense of the experiment and such further charge as they think the business will bear. It is difficult, if not impossible, to punish these combinations as conspiracies without such invasion of private right as would, perhaps, constitute an equivalent or greater evil. It is evident, however, that there must be devised some system of regulation to meet a new danger with new remedies. Possibly rascalities of this nature may be repressed by taxation. At any rate, if the 'trusts' be not conspiracies, there should be such publicity of '*their understandings among gentlemen*' as to enable the public to take proper measures for self protection."

Comparisons are generally odious, but I shall, nevertheless, attempt to make one. The corporations and "trusts" of this gloriously free country may well be compared to the aristocracy in Europe in their relations with the people: both are tolerated and highly privileged, although the corporations and "trusts" are far more influential, powerful, and injurious here than are the aristocracy of Europe in their own countries. And, inconsistent as it may appear, many of our "Fourth of July orators" and others loudly denounce the blooded and titled aristocracy of Europe, which does not and can not injure us here, but say nothing about the great combinations here in our midst, and allow them to continue to rule and rob us. Let us just for a moment look at things as they really are. Practically, all the great necessities of life in this country, excepting only the air—and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that would be monopolized if it had solidity, like the earth—are now controlled by soulless and mercenary combinations. Are these things inevitable? Are they the legitimate product of our civilization? If they are, we had better begin anew. But they are not the outgrowth of progress. They are rather fungous growths—horrible excrescences. They are the fruits of bad legislation; and bad judicial construction of already bad laws. Laws enacted by professional politicians have erected monopolies that have already absorbed more than one-half of the wealth of the country and like vampires are sucking the life-blood of the people. The unorganized masses of consumers and producers can protect themselves against these "trusts" in but one way, and that is through laws which will utterly overthrow and prevent such giant growths. The primary object and justification of government is to protect the weak and prevent a powerful few from wronging the many. But if we cannot bring the Standard Oil Trust into subjection to the law, how will we ever cope with all those other "trusts" organized for the express purpose of evading all laws Congress may pass, and to violate with impunity every State law that can be enacted. But these combinations have at present such a powerful grip upon Congresses and Legislatures, that they will not permit efficient laws to restrain them to be enacted. Think of it! It is estimated by reliable authority that much more of the wealth of the United States is now owned and controlled by corporations and monopolistic trusts, than by private persons. Fifty years ago corporations were nothing; now they are everything. They dominate all channels of activity; they control governors, judges and legislatures; they make hewers of wood and drawers of water of all who are outside of their charmed circles. It is perhaps well, from an orthodox, fire and brimstone standpoint, that they are soulless entities without moral responsibility. Or what would be their future state? The first telegraph line ever built in the United States was largely built at the expense of the Federal Government. Suppose that the government had then bought out Mr. Morse and extended the system gradually over the country, would the men managing it have exercised any more political influence than has at all times been exercised by Jay Gould and his partners in the present management of the telegraphic system of the country? That there might have been stealing goes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without saying; but, basing our knowledge upon human experience, there is no probability that Government officials could ever have stolen such amounts as are represented by the "water" in the stock of the Western Union Telegraph Company, on which those using the telegraph are taxed to pay dividends. The same truth applies to the Pacific railroads. They were built by private parties with money obtained from the sale of Government bonds and lands. The men who obtained control of this work not only paid to themselves extravagant prices for doing it, but they robbed the treasury of thirty-three millions of dollars over and above their own estimate of the cost of the roads. The building of a road to the Pacific was at the time a military, political, and commercial necessity, and it was on that ground that Government aid was given in its construction. But if the Government had a right to help build it—it had a right to build it without the aid of private parties. Had it done so, and then operated it, there might have been some stealing, and the managers might have gained some political influence, but does any one imagine that they could have gained such influence over Congress as that exercised by the railway ring, and disclosed by the Credit Mobilier investigation, or that all of them together could have committed such robberies as have been exposed by the recent report of the Pacific Railway Commission?

Government officials would have been sent to the penitentiary for the hundredth part of the offenses that have made private citizens "great financiers," governors, judges and United States Senators. Had the Government built the Pacific railroads and the telegraph lines and kept them in its possession the cost of the building would by this time have ceased to be a factor in operating them. This would have been a few big steps towards an important and permanent advantage to the people at large. It would mean cheaper telegraphic facilities, cheaper travel and cheaper transportation for freight for all time to come. But instead of having what should be really theirs, they are now compelled to pay large tribute to a few millionaires for its use. And yet in the very teeth of these facts the work of creating new gigantic and dangerous "trusts" or combinations, seems to be increasing and going steadily on. The plain truth is that gigantic corporations like the Pacific railroads and the Western Union Telegraph Company are beyond and above the control of municipal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ordinances or State laws. It is even doubted by many, whether the vast powers of the General Government will prove to be sufficiently potential against such an aggregation of capital and brains. Exercising functions that are largely public in their character they nevertheless enjoy all the rights and all the advantages of private enterprises. As absolutely essential agencies for the transaction of business they are protected by the business interests of the country from the operation of laws enacted for the purpose of bringing them into subjection to authority.

There is nothing democratic about such vast monopolies for controlling those channels through which intelligence and traffic are effected. Competition is crushed by its very weight, holding business men by the throat, and forcing them to deliver. They are despotic in spirit, tyrannical in method, openly hostile to liberty and free institutions, and threatening menaces to the pursuit of happiness, and to equality and equal opportunities under the law. When the people of this country once get their eyes wide open they will hardly permit such dangerous excrescences to fasten their deathlike grip upon our liberties and our laws; and if the recent consolidation of the Baltimore and Ohio Telegraph Company with the Western Union shall have the practical effect to direct public attention seriously to the monstrous and abnormal growth of the Western Union monopoly, there will arise such a loud and vigorous protest of public sentiment in opposition to the general introduction of such a dangerous factor in public and business affairs, as will raise such a flood tide of antagonism that those who have provoked it must not complain if they shall be swept beyond the line of justice by its violence. They are so big that they will not be admonished; they will not bend, and that means that sooner or later they must be broken. No doubt there are a great many well meaning people in this country who are allowing foolish fears to make them think and act falsely, not only to their own true interests, but to their Americanism, to their natural tenddencies and honest convictions. They view the steady growth of monopolistic monstrosities with increasing alarm, but they do nothing to prevent it. They ardently believe in democratic institutions, and feel their hearts stirred now and then by the old-time passion for liberty, and yet shut their eyes to the steady growth of a public sentiment among the friends of monopoly in favor of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a "strong government" that will depend on force alone for the maintenance of public order. Why is this? There is on the other hand a growing sentiment of unrest and disgust among all who really believe in democratic institutions. They begin to see that something must be done, but they are not agreed as to what that something is. Many of them wilfully shut their eyes to the only remedy that can put an end to the tendency that enables rich men to rule.

It is poverty, not ignorance, that makes voters submissive. Ignorance does not make men humble; it makes them conceited. It is dependence, not fear, that enables the rich man to carry his followers to the polls, as the old baron took his retainers into battle. The only salvation for republican institutions is the utter abolition of our present system of tolerating unequal opportunities, whether they be natural or the creatures of law.

Harshly as the system grates on the true interests and the sense of justice of the people, they are but slowly provoked to aggressive action; but when they once plainly see these great so-called trusts reaching out to control arbitrarily the cost of necessaries of business or of life, there will be a speedy popular combination against the combines, and it will be revolutionary if revolutionary action shall n. ded to overthrow this assault upon the natural and economic laws of production and consumption, and of supply and demand. There is, however, still a faint ray of hope to some people since the colossal conspirators of the Pacific railroads have come forward with a compromise to fund the proceeds of their rascality into a fifty years' bond, and other "trusts" may do the same later on. The lamented Judge Black once described such a scheme as this, as an invention to increase the plunderer's stealing powers, "through which his felonious fingers are made long enough to reach into the pockets of posterity," so that he "lays his lien on property yet uncreated, anticipates the labor of coming ages, coins the industry of future generations into cash, and snatches the inheritance from children whose fathers are unborn."

W. M. RAPSHER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR. MATTHEW ARNOLD ON AMERICA.

In the last number of the *Nineteenth Century* Mr. Matthew Arnold labors for the humanization of America. It seems to be his hobby. Our great dangers, as he sees them, are "self-glorification and self-deception"—"the predominance of the common and ignoble, born of the predominance of the average man." We should accept kindly the whole warning Mr. Arnold gives us, but probably our self-glorification is more annoying to others than dangerous to ourselves. Self-deception is a far more serious matter; —but are we guilty of it? Certainly we are told often and plainly of our faults, and even Mr. Arnold admits that we are a shrewd and progressive people and have fine political institutions. Perhaps he is deceiving himself concerning our self-deception, but we must listen patiently and strive to find out our faults and correct them. Our newspapers ought to help us in this, but they, Mr. Arnold says, are very bad. Upon this point, however, he speaks as an aggrieved party. Our newspapers were unkind to him, and he is only "getting even." When he went west from New York he was armed with a letter to Joe Medill, the old-time editor of the Chicago *Tribune*. Notwithstanding Mr. Arnold's safeguard, that paper, as he tells us, pictured him by saying "he has harsh features, supercilious manners, parts his hair down the middle, wears a single eye-glass and ill-fitting clothes." The same paper afterwards marred this graphic sketch by calling him a "cur." Mr. Arnold is not to blame for resenting such treatment from our press, though in seeking his revenge he is not proceeding in a way to promote the "sense of elevation" for which it is the purpose of his article to contend.

Mr. Arnold says that "the common and ignoble is human nature's enemy;" and "the predominance of the common and ignoble, born of the predominance of the average man," is the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

malady in which he sees the greatest danger to us especially, and to humanity generally. This may be a danger in countries whose political institutions and social laws provide for the survival of the *un*fittest; but how can it be a serious danger where distinction and predominance flow only from merit? Are we deceiving ourselves in denying "the predominance of the common and ignoble" in our country? To find the most suitable term for expressing the special deficiency of America, Mr. Arnold turns to his master, Carlyle, who tried to dissuade a younger brother from emigrating by saying to him, "Could you banish yourself from all that is interesting to your mind—forget the history, the glorious institutions, the noble principles of old Scotland, that you may eat a better dinner perhaps?" Mr. Arnold says of this, "I am not saying that Carlyle's advice was good, or that young men should not emigrate. I do but take note, in the word *interesting*, of a requirement, a cry of aspiration, a cry not sounding in the imaginative Carlyle's breast only, but sure of response in his brother's breast also, and in human nature."

Carlyle's argument to his brother was that "*the history, the glorious institutions, the noble principles*" of their own country were so interesting that he ought not to banish himself from them for the sake of bettering his fortune. He presented the attractions which Scotland afforded to a native, as a sufficient season for staying at home. Mr. Arnold commits the absurdity of citing this in a criticism of America, because he, an Englishman, does not find America *interesting*. Of course *our* "history, glorious institutions, and noble principles" may fail to be interesting to Sir Leppel Griffin, Mr. Matthew Arnold, or any other foreigner; but we cannot admit that we are uninteresting, in fact, without first inquiring whom we should interest to escape the verdict of our self-constituted judge. Surely we have been interesting to British sovereigns from Victoria all the way back to George the Third, and to British statesmen from Gladstone to Pitt; and it is beyond dispute that we have proved interesting to the British army and navy wherever we have met them—especially the parts commanded by Burgoyne, Cornwallis, Packenham, Dacre and Barclay. Mr. Arnold cites one of our newspapers as saying: "Wales says Mary is a darling," the meaning being that the Prince of Wales "expressed great admiration for Miss Mary Anderson." This reminds us to claim that Miss Anderson, an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American, is *interesting* the British people in the histrionic art; and it may be added that Buffalo Bill, with the unmatched skill of his cow-boys in riding bucking ponies, is interesting them (to coin a word) in the *horseonic* art. There is nothing elevating or interesting in hobby-horse-riding over America's faults, but bucking ponies *elevate* humanity, and are interesting—especially to the part of humanity that gets *elevated.*

Notwithstanding the fact that it is Mr. Arnold who charges us with being *uninteresting,* his own writings afford evidence that we have been somewhat *interesting* to him. But Mr. Arnold gives the word *interesting* a meaning to suit himself, and the *interesting,* as he understands it, is not to be found in the quarters just mentioned. His "requirement," his "cry of aspiration" is for the *interesting* of another kind. He takes from Carlyle the word *interesting,* as the very one for his purpose ("There is *our* word launched," he says with evident glee), but he proceeds at once to give the word a meaning of his own. For Carlyle, *the interesting,* was in the "history, the glorious institutions, the noble principles" of his country. For Mr. Arnold, "the great sources of the *interesting* are distinction and beauty,"—(not history, glorious institutions, noble principles)—and we fail, Mr. Arnold says, to come up to his standard. Our deficiency, according to Mr. Arnold himself, is due largely to our freedom from the rot of the feudal ages. "If we in England," he says, "were without the cathedrals, parish churches and castles of the Catholic and feudal age, and without the houses of the Elizabethan age, but had only the towns and buildings which the rise of our middle class has created in the modern age, we should be in much the same case as the Americans."

Then, it is old cathedrals, churches, and castles, "you know," that make the present generation of Englishmen *interesting.*

We may not boast with Mr. Arnold on guard, but we need not be discouraged by our lack of ruins and relics of folly and superstition.

Mr. Arnold says of our country: "There is little to nourish and delight the sense of beauty there. In the long settled States east of the Alleghanies, the landscape in general is not interesting, the climate harsh and in extremes." This is a shallow as well as an unjust criticism. He charges an whole country with possessing little to nourish and delight the sense of beauty, and in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

support of the charge specifies that in one small part of it "the landscape *in general* is not interesting, the climate harsh and in extremes." We may fairly demur to what Mr. Arnold says of the landscape and climate east of the Alleghanies; and his stereotyped charge of boastfulness must not deter us from pointing out the shallowness of his criticism of a country extending from the home of storms and ice in the North, to the land of sun and flowers in the South, and from the Atlantic in the East to the Pacific in the West, possessing nearly every form and shade of beautiful landscape, and every variety of desirable climate that nature has vouchsafed to the earth.

Mr. Arnold turns from landscape and climate to men, and says: "As to distinction, and the interest human nature seeks from enjoying the effect made upon it by what is elevated, the case is much the same. There is very little to create such effect, very much to thwart it. Goethe says somewhere that 'the thrill of awe is the best thing humanity has;' but, if there be a discipline in which the Americans are wanting, it is the discipline of awe and respect."

There may be some truth in this. We stand in awe only of God and His works, and, therefore, we are not as *aw-fully* disciplined as people who are thrilled all their lives by the presence of "Majesties," "Lords," and other born aristocrats. But we are not wholly lacking in the discipline of respect for men.

Mr. Arnold says: "In truth, everything is against distinction in America, and against the sense of elevation to be gained by examining and respecting it." He is entirely wrong. In no country on earth is there a fairer field for distinction or a distinction more respected. *But it must be the distinction of merit.* We have no respect for a man of poor intelligence and bad character, because he may claim the distinction of being born a lord, or the like; nor do we admit that any "sense of elevation" would be gained by "admiring and respecting" such distinction.

Mr. Arnold, maintaining that we are without men of distinction, says: "Now, Lincoln is shrewd, sagacious, humorous, honest, courageous, firm; he is a man with qualities deserving the most sincere esteem and praise, but he has not distinction." Without chaffering about the meaning of the word distinction, it is certain—distinction or no distinction—that Lincoln's ability,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

character, and deeds have given us all the "sense of elevation" that we can gain by admiration and respect for man. No higher "sense of elevation" could be created among us by trying to learn respect for the distinction of those born aristocrats, who are neither "shrewd, sagacious, humorous, courageous, nor firm"—men entirely destitute of "qualities deserving esteem and respect." In short, we are unable to do better in the cause of humanization, by "admiration and respect," than to admire and respect merit.

Mr. Arnold's essay upon General Grant, published a year or so ago, and his article in the last number of the *Nineteenth Century Magazine*, indicate that he labors under two difficulties: that instead of being clear, his stream of thought is muddy; and that he is not master of his mother tongue. If the two essays just mentioned are English literature (and they pass for it), then, at the risk of "self-glorification" and "self-deception," let us persevere in the development of American literature.

JAMES B. FRY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TESTIMONY BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEES.

No one has a right to demand as a matter of right that he shall be heard by a Committee of the House. The constitutional right of petition to Congress has nothing whatever to do with the claim to be heard in argument before a Committee. It is a matter of discretion with a Committee as to the mode in which it will seek information concerning subjects referred to its consideration.

The claim latterly made by the manufacturers, and those who profess to speak in their name, that they shall have "the right" to be heard, grows out of the general impression of those gentlemen that a tariff bill is largely private legislation for the benefit of the manufacturers, and that being so they have the right to represent their private interests before the Committee of Ways and Means.

The majority of the Committee believe that a tariff bill, like all other public legislation, should be based upon the interests of the public, while, of course, no harm, if it could be prevented, should be done to any private interest. As a matter of experience in former Congresses, these "hearings" were carefully prepared, and often disingenuous arguments, having the effect, whether intended so or not, to confuse and mislead, and so prepared as to conceal rather than to give information.

The gentlemen who proposed to appear were not to come as witnesses to be put upon oath and subject to cross-examination, nor did they propose to reveal to the Committee the cost of the particular article which the particular gentlemen manufactured, so that the Committee might ascertain from them what was the precise difference between the cost of the article manufactured in America and a similar article manufactured abroad. Nor did they propose to give to the Committee as a whole any information not obtainable by any member of the Committee in conversation with these gentlemen or others engaged in similar business; but solely to appear as organizations, associations or committees to present argu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments prepared for the purpose of influencing the Committee to legislate in their particular interest; to bring pressure to bear upon the Committee by the appearance of the powerful organizations they represented, and to organize all the protected industries in one combined resistance against any legislation which would undertake to change the present excessive protection.

The mass of material accessible for the purpose of tariff legislation was, in the judgment of the majority, sufficient to render these "hearings" unnecessary. In addition to the testimony taken before the Tariff Commission and the hearings taken before the Ways and Means Committees of the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses, and the very full statistical reports of the various bureaux of the Government, printed arguments in the shape of pamphlets, circulars and letters by persons interested in every industry affected by any possible change in the tariff, were sent to each member of the Committee, and possibly to all the members of the House. Therefore every member of the Committee had abundant means to inform himself as to the facts necessary to reach an intelligent conclusion concerning the matters that were under discussion.

The Committee also felt that the granting of permission to hear any one argument from those representing any one industry was a pledge on its part to hear all other industries, or all other persons professing to represent them, and it was not willing to grant such permission, in view of the possible delay which would occur.

The Committee also knew that any bill it reported would have to undergo discussion in the Committee of the Whole under the five-minute rule; that there was no factory or interest that did not have on the floor some member of Congress who felt that natural and just interest in its development that would render him certain to make himself familiar with the facts concerning the question, and thus submit those facts to the consideration of the House upon his responsibility as a representative.

C. P. BRECKENRIDGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PHYSICAL BASIS OF BRAIN-WORK.

Is THERE any element in brain-work but the physical?

"Doctors differ," but upon this point all agree, that it is the only element in that complicated process, which we possess any material means of studying or modifying, and hence is entitled practically to our undivided attention, as physiologists. We are totally unable to imprison a thought beneath our cover-glass, to ascertain the specific gravity of a concept, or the form and color of a moral judgment, but we can observe and study the thought-organ, and determine under what conditions of its substance these processes are advanced or retarded, and crudely measure their intensity by the amount of energy expended. This has been found to bear sufficiently constant relation to the intensity of the process, to afford a rough indication of the force and vigor of the mental operation. Following closely upon this comes the question, "Is the measure of the physiological efficiency and integrity of the thought organ the measure of the intellectual capacity of the individual?" and further and still more pertinent to our range of inquiry, "Is the development of the thought-organ always proportionate with the development of the other tissues of the body?" in other words, "Is a good brain likely to accompany a good physique?" Recent investigations have answered the first question for us by showing conclusively that the brains of those of marked ability in any particular field are unmistakably superior, both in size, weight and complexity of structure, to those of the average of their fellows. The second question yet remains unanswered, and my object in this sketch is briefly to submit a few considerations bearing upon its solution. We all know what the popular theory upon this question is, that brain must be developed at the expense of muscle, and muscle at the expense of brain; that a man cannot be good for both at once, and the typical hard student is necessarily

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pale and stooped shouldered, while the typical athlete or muscle worker is as stupid as the brutes whom he rivals in strength. But popular opinion is not infallible, and with all due deference to it, we would respectfully appeal to the judgment of history and science.

Taking, first, a comprehensive view of the historical data bearing upon the subject, we find two classes of facts, one consisting of comparisons between individuals of the same race in different ages, and the other of comparison between indivi luals of races of different degrees of civilization in the same age ; and the evidence from both classes is unmistakably uniform. In the first class, the few data at our command most decidedly indicate that in spite of our Iliads and Heroics the "men of these degenerate days" are not only healthier and longer-lived, but taller and heavier than their ancestors and predecessors from five hundred to one thousand years ago, inasmuch as they can neither squeeze into their armor, handle their swords, nor even lie down in their coffins.

Many of the suits of armor in the Tower of London would be a tight fit for boys of sixteen to-day, while the average British soldier finds his hand cramped for room on the hilts of the renowned cross-hilted swords of the Crusaders, and going a step further back, the old Greek stone coffins sarcophagi are nearly half a head too short for the average man of to-day.

Such records as we possess, of any scientific accuracy, of the feats of physical prowess, such as running, leaping and hurling the stone, would be easily beaten by our modern athletes.

The other class of data indicate with almost equal clearness that, with a few exceptions, the higher the degree of civilization of a race the greater the perfection of its physical development; in other words, the history of civilization would seem to be the history of an improving physique.

The Indians of our Western plains, the Bushmen and the Hottentots of South Africa, the Negroes of the Gold Coast, the Hindoos of the Indian peninsula, the Terra del Fuegans of the Antarctic, the Esquimaux of the Arctic circle, are all almost as markedly inferior to their Aryan contemporaries as the mustang is to the English thoroughbred.

Many as are the stories which are related of Indian speed and endurance, their fleetest couriers can be both out-run and out-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

winded even by amateurs who have submitted to a similar course of training, while their inferiority in wrestling, boxing, and other feats of strength needs only to be referred to.

A civilized man can beat the savage at his own game, and even with his own weapons. A series of scientific experiments has established the fact that the contractile power of the average Frenchman's biceps is nearly twenty per cent. and that of an Englishman's nearly twenty-five per cent. greater than that of the average Tasmanian's.

What light does the history of the four great world empires throw upon this question? What relations existed between the stages of their physical development and their hold upon their imperial power?

When we are first introduced to them, we find the Babylonians a nation of simple, hardy Chaldean shepherds and hunters, living in tents, and compelled, from the very nature of their circumstances, to develop and depend upon a vigorous physique as their means of existence.

It was these qualities that made them the masters of the then known world, but with power came riches and their almost invariable accompaniment, luxury and effeminacy. They forgot how to fight, a fatal symptom in any nation; their wars are all carried on by mercenaries, their cattle are tended, their leopards killed, their houses builded, and every manly function performed by slaves, whilst they are crowding themselves together in cities, lounging in hanging gardens, gorging themselves with dainties, and rotting the last fibre of their manhood with wine. What is the inevitable result? Outraged nature revenges herself; and there suddenly appears on their northwestern frontier a people, who might almost be regarded as the re-embodiment of the spirits of their ancestors. A mere handful of brave, hardy mountaineers, living by the chase, and capable of existing on beech nuts and goat's flesh, they swept everything before them, and gathering force as they advanced, utterly overthrew the world's capital herself, and made her empire a thing of the past.

The "fittest" had survived, but so had the law of selection, and at last, after years of unlimited power, they too became subject to its penalty.

Wealth and idleness had softened their muscles, unstrung their nerves and weakened their courage, and they too were "weighed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the balance and found wanting." In the very zenith of their power, one of their most adventurous expeditions brought back reports of an insignificant little nation, inhabiting a rocky peninsula and the adjacent groups of islands just beyond their extreme western frontier, who had actually had the hardihood to assist one of their satraps in a rebellion against his master, and an army of myriads was at once dispatched to bring them captives to be placed on exhibition. They declined to come, and so emphatic and convincing was their refusal that nearly one-fourth of the Persian army was constrained to remain as a fertilizer for that stony little peninsula, while another moiety furnished a royal banquet for the Mediterranean fishes. Thinking there must have been some misunderstanding, the invitation was repeated even more urgently than before, with nearly two millions of couriers to bear the message, and Marathon, Salamis, and Thermopylæ were the Greek notes of acceptance, signed after the ancient custom, in the blood of the writer.

For scarcely a century longer had the Persian degeneracy progressed, when the sword of Alexander suddenly flashed above their national horizon, and in six short years his invincible little wedges of human bone and brawn had rent the empire of Darius into a thousand fragments, never again to be united. Wherein lay the Grecian superiority? A single incident furnishes the key to the whole question. When the Persian invasion was impending the Greeks naturally shrunk from meeting such myriads single-handed, but their confidence was instantly restored when the first Persian prisoners brought in were publicly stripped and their slender muscles and soft white skins exposed to view.

It was the contest of men against weaklings and they had no fears for the result.

The three hundred who held hundreds of thousands at bay at Thermopylæ, and the men who scattered the barbarian myriads like chaff at the Granicus, were the results of centuries of the most careful artificial selection to which the human race has ever been subjected.

For generations the weaklings had been destroyed in infancy and only the robust and vigorous permitted to survive; in childhood they had been cradled in the hollow of their father's shield; their earliest playthings had been the dull spear and the wooden sword; from earliest boyhood they had been dieted, trained, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hardened as skillfully and rigidly as gladiators preparing for the arena; and the legitimate result was, not only a physique, which in strength and beauty has never yet been surpassed, if equaled, but also a brain which in vigor of conception and keenness of insight still holds its place in the very foremost ranks of the march of intellect.

Had they preserved the balance of their powers they might have been masters of the world to-day, but again the inevitable law of decadence after maturity becomes manifest.

The lists of the Olympic games are thronged with professionals; a Plato is heard lamenting that their gymnasia have become mere arenas for the exhibition of feats of skill by hired athletes, the living "bricks" in the walls of Sparta are replaced by mercenaries, and intellectual and moral degeneracy surely and rapidly follow. Already the screaming of the Roman eagles is heard upon their western coasts and grand old Greece falls, almost without a struggle, before a people who are vastly her inferiors in every particular, save their physical vigor and a wolfish greed for battle.

The Roman was essentially a fighting animal. He was bred and trained as such, and his short, heavy sword, driven by his strong right arm and directed by the brain which inevitably accompanied it, carved out a world empire, the most splendid and most enduring that the race has ever looked upon.

All our forms of legal and political thought still bear the stamp of Rome, and every school boy is familiar with the history of her rise and fall.

It is the old, old story of riches, luxury, and effeminacy, and a horde of athletic savages, our ancestors, shatter to atoms the greatest political masterpiece of any age.

The whole history of the human race bears more than a fanciful analogy to the old fable of Tullus, the giant son of the Earth, whom even Hercules for a long time was unable to conquer, since every time he was thrown he derived fresh strength from contact with his mother, the Earth, but whose strength and life rapidly ebbed away when lifted clear of the earth and held in mid-air by the wily Greek, after he had learned the secret of his power.

Once let the human race be cut off from personal contact with the soil, once let the conventionalities and artificial restrictions of so-called civilization interfere with the healthful simplicity of nature, and decay is certain.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But, it may be objected, was not the predominant element in these old world empires largely physical, so that physical conditions would principally determine their permanence?

While admitting the partial truth of this suggestion, we are prepared to go a step further, and meet the objection on grounds to which no such exception can be taken.

If we were to ask what three nations had made the most forcible impression upon human thought, we should probably be pointed to the Greeks, the English, and the Germans.

If we can prove that these three nations have or had some quality in common which was especially prominent either just before or during their period of greatest intellectual vigor, and whose decline was rapidly followed by a corresponding intellectual decay, we shall at least have some right to regard it as an important factor in their supremacy.

Let us turn to the pages of history and see if we can discover this common factor. It certainly is not their form of government, for the Greeks lived mainly under a democratic oligarchy; the English under a constitutional monarchy; the Germans, until of late, under a despotism; it is not their race nor their climate, nor their geographical position, least of all their religion; in fine, their only prominent feature in common is their magnificent physique, and for this they are probably more conspicuously distinguished than any other nations of history.

Their reputation for physical prowess was second only to the renown of their intellect.

More than this, in all three their period of greatest physical vigor invariably immediately preceded or accompanied their most conspicuous intellectual triumphs, and its decadence was always promptly followed by intellectual degeneracy.

The Greeks were bred and reared a nation of athletes; the gymnasium was as indispensable as the temple or the home, manly strength and skill were well nigh deified, and the victor in the great Olympic games considered scarcely less than a god, and yet these magnificent animals have left on record not only forms that for strength and symmetry are alike the wonder and the despair of all succeeding generations, but the most magnificent type of intellectual beauty, the broadest and clearest views of the problems of government, the most intense love of freedom, and the greatest systems of deductive philosophy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which the race has ever known, while in poetry, sculpture, and architecture, the arts which appeal to the finest faculties of man, the world still sits at their feet. The Greek biceps and the Grecian profile were inseparably connected, and Homer, Solon, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Sophocles were both the legitimate products and the ardent supporters of the Greek gymnasia. From the days of the captives in the Romish slave market who excited the admiration of Gregory to the Peninsular campaign of Wellington and the adamantine human wall from which the charge of the old guard rolled back shattered and broken at Waterloo, British bone and sinew has compelled the admiration even of its enemies, and has formed the solid foundation of England's intellectual greatness.

Even to-day the most prominent features in the popular conception of an Englishman are his love of the bath-tub, his enormous appetite and his intense devotion to field sports and exercise of every description.

The most rugged and inaccessible mountain chains cannot separate him from his bath-tub, his carnivorous appetite excites the horror of the vegetarian Hindoos, and is indulged at the very risk of his own life, while he lays out cricket-creases and tennis-courts at the very equator.

Can we hold that the connection is a purely accidental one between the tireless physical vigor and bull-dog tenacity of life and purpose of the English race, and the fact of their tongue being the language of millions upon millions, and bidding fair to become the universal thought-medium ; their empire, upon which the sun never sets ; the priceless services they have rendered to the cause of civil and religious liberty, and the intellectual influence represented by such names as Pitt and Gladstone, Carlyle and Bacon, Wesley and Spurgeon, Newton, Darwin, and Spencer ?

The great national movement of Germany, which has been accompanied by such a remarkable display of intellectual energy, as is signalized by the names of Leibnitz and Kant, Goethe and Schiller, Helmholtz and Virchow, Bismarck and Von Moltke, has its foundation in the almost intolerable military drill and warlike training of the two Fredericks, was fostered by the bitter object lesson on the value of physical prowess, inculcated by the wars of Napoleon, and was inseparably connected with the rise of the great Turnverein system of gymnastics under Father Jahn.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To-day, wherever the German tongue is spoken, together with the poetry of Schiller and the music of Wagner, is found the Turner's gymnasium, and again muscle and brain go hand in hand.

When we turn to the data furnished us by individuals, the physical basis, if not the physical nature of brain work, becomes even more apparent.

It has been proved by actual experiment that great men have not only heavier and finer brains, but taller, heavier, and handsomer bodies than the average of their contemporaries.

The facts established by Beard in his remarkable paper on the longevity of brain workers are familiar to all. Even such a body of questionably great men as the Congress of the United States will be found to average higher in height, girth, weight, and physical beauty than any similar body of their constituents. Whenever we meet a distinguished man, or even see his portrait, we instinctively look for the physical evidences of his mental power, and seldom are we disappointed. There are exceptions, of course, to every rule, but the law of dependence of mental vigor upon physical is well nigh as invariable as the law of heredity, and Little Tommy Green's familiar question, "How large was Alexander, pa, the people called him great?" was after all but the naïve expression of primitive humanity's instinctive expectation, that physical must accompany mental greatness. Lincoln's exploits as a wrestler and rail splitter; Conkling's as a boxer; Gladstone's as a tree-feller; the youthful feats of strength and daring of Bismarck, and the magnificent physiques of Burke and Pitt, Webster and Beecher, Huxley, Bancroft, and Tennyson are not as familiar to the world as their deeds of intellectual prowess, but they are just as essential characteristics of the men.

To the question, "Why this relation exists?" physiology returns us a few brief but suggestive answers. 1st. That the voluntary muscles are the true blood-supply-regulator of the whole organism; in other words, that the brain of a man whose muscles are the most thoroughly developed and frequently exercised will have the fullest and richest supply of life blood; in short, that good muscle means good possibility of brain work. 2d. That as the muscles are both the protectors and the tools of the brain, the more perfect their development the greater the ease with which it can both escape injury and perform the functions necessary to the support of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

animal life, thus leaving a greater proportion of its power to be expended in the direction of purely intellectual development; and third, that even the simplest co-ordinate successive contractions of muscle-fibre draw upon and develop not only the five senses and their centres, but large tracts of the cortex itself, which if not immediately concerned in the higher mental processes are most intimately connected with the cells and tracts that are.

What recognition of this important interdependence do we find in most of our systems of education? Almost none, except in our colleges, in which the growth of athletics, stimulated probably by the late war, is one of the most encouraging features of the times. Fortunately, the fashion is rapidly spreading downward, but we, as physicians, must most strenuously insist upon a more important and practical recognition of this truth, than the introduction of ten minutes of dumb-bell exercise or calisthenics in six or eight hours of study.

Our common school pupils are crammed and forced and gorged with intellectual pabulum from six to nine hours a day, while they are at best simply advised and often only permitted to spend from one to three hours a day in the open air, too often in such an exhausted condition as to be incapable of really vigorous play, and this indisposition is too often increased by repeated feminine admonitions, not to waste too much time in play, or to indulge in energetically vigorous sports, because they are "so rough and horrid" and spoil their nice clothes.

A host of instructors, consisting almost exclusively of weak and nervous females, is busily engaged in impressing upon the rising generation that intellectual greatness is the only thing worth striving for, and that physical prowess is worthy only of navvies and pugilists, as the means of its development are so very "ungentlemanly" and "unlady-like." Being almost wholly under petticoat government, not only in the school, but, alas! too often in the home, at a time when his ideals for life are being formed, a boy is almost compelled to form his conceptions of manly vigor from pugilists and professional sports, while the mischief is intensified in both sexes from the pernicious and premature sexual development, which inevitably results from our boasted system of co-education. If our school children of to-day were to spend four hours out of the eight in vigorous, pleasant out-door exercise, they would accom-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plish more in the remaining four than they do now in the entire eight, and with infinitely less strain upon their vital forces. This may seem a startling proposition, but it has been more than proved, not only by the experience of our university and college students, but also by the experiments of Mr. Chadwick, among the factory children in England, on what is known as the "half-time system," by which the children were given four hours, not of vigorous recreation in the open air, but of regular work in the factory, and then four hours of study, with the surprising result that they made better progress, with less effort, than those who studied the whole eight hours.

The best brain-workers of to-day in England and on the Continent spend only three to five hours per diem at the desk or in the laboratory. In view of these facts, it seems to me that the following modifications in our present common school system of education would be at least desirable: 1st. That a play-ground for summer and a well-equipped gymnasium for winter should become indispensable adjuncts of every graded school building. 2d. That for every hour of study the pupil should be expected, and, if necessary, obliged to spend an equal time in vigorous physical exercise, if possible, in the open air, for proficiency in which credit should be given him in his final average. 3d. That a thorough knowledge of the laws of health and the physiology of exercise should be required of every teacher. 4th. That at least half of the teachers should be men, and be selected with a view to not only their mental and moral, but also their physical fitness, to become the ideals of the rising generation.

WOODS HUTCHINSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF CONGRESS.

IMAGINE a medium sized man in clerical cut clothes, and a dark grayish beard. His sightless eyes are cast upwards, and in a melodious voice and well measured accents he is delivering the morning prayer to the House. To me there is something indescribably solemn in this blind man's exhortation. Congressmen are not proverbial for their reverence, but their attention at prayers is always respectful, and compares favorably with that of Senators at the other end of the Capitol.

Indeed there is only one Senator, I understand, who makes a rule of always being on hand at prayers, and the president of that august body has grown so accustomed to the absence of the rest that instead of calling upon them as a whole, he simply expresses the hope that the Senator from that particular State "will please come to order." Be this as it may, the anecdote has given time for the prayer of our chaplain to draw to a close. The Speaker's gavel descends with a sharp rap that breaks the spell, and a moment after the clerk is reading, in a hard prosaic voice, the doings of the previous day. This concluded, the reports of committees are made, and this in turn over, the House settles down to business. Do I say "settles down," rather startles up into life. What a hub-bub it is! To the novice it appears the very realization of the Anarch's dream; but gradually, as he watches, studies and observes, he gets hold of the end of the skein and undoes the snarl.

Then he begins to appreciate what a wonderful machine the organism of the House is. I say machine, for it is literally a machine. A machine in the highest acceptation of the word, and the noise is but the gyrations and the revolutions of its numberless wheels.

To be anything here you must be part of this machinery: the big wheels being the Chairmen of the prominent committees and making in their revolutions the most noise; the little wheels making not quite so much, but still making quite sufficient. Like all ma-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chines, too, this is cruel. A new member gets up to air his eloquence because he has not yet had time to become a part of the cosmos of the House, to fit himself into its wonderful system; the machine falls upon him, crushes him, rolls him out flat and throwing him to one side goes on in its heartless, pittiless regularity as before. For this reason the career of a Randolph Churchill would be a matter of absolute impossibility here, and if you will search the records you will find that not a solitary member has made during his first term quite the mark that precocious young man did in Parliament. In short there is less jumping into sudden prominence with us, and though there are brilliant exceptions to this, as in the cases of Mr. Cockran, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Lodge and Mr. Raynor, in a general way distinction in the House is usefulness in the House, and this usefulness can alone be purchased by a long apprenticeship.

The rules of the House encompass you and embarrass you as a net which only gradually and slowly falls away from about your limbs.

Nevertheless new members are apt to think that they know these rules; they have read them up of course, and probably have learnt them by heart. Three months afterwards it gradually dawns upon them that they are as ignorant of their practical application as they are of the characters of the Chinese grammar. Four years later, if sufficiently fortunate to be occasionally called to the Chair, they may occasionally be detected earnestly conferring as to some vexed question of order with the journal clerk, whose advice, if they are sensible, they will be quick to take and to express accordingly.

The last journal clerk used to be of invaluable assistance to a new chairman. He was the arbiter of arbiters on any matter of House regulation when all other arbiters have failed. In a sense Harry Smith was and might even be now considered the very center of the hub of our political system, for he has codified the rules that govern the most important branch of the law-making power of the United States.

What is the use of these rules? To facilitate the business of law making? No, decidedly not. Then it is to prevent legislation. Well, I will not go quite so far as to assert that. Their purpose rather is to prevent hasty legislation, and they are resorted to by the minority to protect themselves.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notice how magnificently the leader on the wrong side of the House employs them. Notice how by means of them he often makes the wrong come right. I must confess I am a great admirer of this gentleman from Maine, in all but his political principles. As regards his qualities of a speaker, I have heard far more eloquent men and far more brilliant men, but never one who spoke more to the point. You are always sure that he is dead wrong, but he makes you think at the moment that he is dead right, for he not only has the talent of knowing just what to say, but the genius of knowing just when to leave off. A somewhat harsh, rasping voice, it stills in a moment the buzz of conversation, penetrating the confused din the way a keen-edged wind will do a fog. His very personality assists his leadership. Heavy and yet not pompous he stands during a debate with head cocked on one side, always attentive. Coming down the aisle, now to the rescue of one of his weaker followers, now to the attack of one of his staunchest adversaries, he is a tower of strength, to which all his party cling. Notice his generalship on the subject of the Speaker's contested seat. See how skillfully he threw the Democrats into the false position of appearing to try to keep "an honest son of toil" out of his rights. Not a man of the Republicans but knew that Carlisle was duly elected; not a man of them but recognized his fairness as a Speaker and felt besides a sincere sympathy for him in his illness; but by a skillful series of manœuvres these sentimental considerations were avoided and the onus of responsibility thrown on the Committee of Elections.

I shall never forget that day, and particularly when it was decided that the contestant should be heard in his own defense. Up to now Thoebe had been an abstraction, but suddenly he rose from among our very midst, where he had been quietly seated unbeknown to us. "That's Theobe; there he is," and every eye was directed to a medium-sized man standing behind a desk. There was something of the *coup de theatre* in the abruptness of his appearance, but I must allow I was rather taken with his looks. An earnest face it seemed to me, as I saw it in profile; a rather low forehead, a slightly turned up nose and a very long goatee like a three-inch stick depending from the end of his chin. Yet it was a sad, care-worn face, a face that never smiled. His black frock coat was buttoned at the last button, and he frequently used his handkerchief to press it to his lips.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His speech, however, was disappointing. With all due allowance for the difficulty of addressing such an assemblage for the first time—as critical, exacting an audience as perhaps exists in the world—his defense hardly came up to what his looks had led us to hope. It was disconnected and rambling, and this could hardly be excused by embarrassment, since he appeared perfectly cool and self-possessed. Nevertheless, he was every now and then vociferously applauded, even by the Democrats, particularly when I think from a slip of the tongue he said, "that he did not consider it much of an honor to be elected to this House."

Equally with the gentleman from Maine the gentleman from Pennsylvania always attracts the attention of a new member, for equally when he speaks a hush falls over Congress. It is the silent homage the House pays, and it pays it conspicuously to these two men. Both these men inspire confidence in their followers, if not enthusiasm. Comparing them together, I should say the one is a great debater, the other a forcible speaker. The one always having *the* word, the other sometimes laboring for *a* word. But this very struggle for utterance, for phraseology, carries with it its own peculiar force, for a crowded brain, as a crowded church, emits its inmates slowly. Vigor, power is in Randall's face, in the nervous twitching of the eyes and mouth (as if about to smile, but that so often do not smile); in the very movement of the shoulders, and still more so in the index finger now pointed outwards, or again as it is raised to the spectacles to lift them up to the forehead from off the eyes. A great, strong, powerful intellect is in this man's head, relieved by a subtle smile that comes at last, and at the least expected moment, to light up the sombre face. And yet he can speak fervently at times. What a meaning there was in his remarks, deeper and truer than mere flowers of rhetoric could convey, when a few weeks ago, in behalf of Congress, he accepted the pictures that Massachusetts had presented of her distinguished speakers. How forcibly he spoke the cares of public men, their responsibilities, their oft unrecompensed labors, and the scantiness of their reward.

Earnest as was his address, however, it offered a striking contrast in style and phraseology to that of Mr. Breckenridge, of Kentucky, who seconded the motion. With a voice as silvery as the silver of his own gray hair he fairly thrilled his hearers, and, passing through all grades of eloquence, he rose to a climax of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oratory at the close that I have never heard equaled, save by Mr. Cockran in his magnificent defense of Mr. White. Alas, the style of Mr. Breckenridge is one that passes away. Everything beautiful is being superseded for the useful, and, fools that we are, we fail to perceive that mere beauty has its purpose. His eloquence is the eloquence of the South, before modern Sheffield and Birmingham came to crush it with their iron wheels. But hurried as the world is, busy as is Congress, it will always make time to listen to the gentleman from Kentucky, and to recognize in him the genial, the graceful, the Prince Charming of Debate.

Of the leader of the Democratic side, I have had fewer opportunities of judging, for, owing to the overwhelming nature of his committee work, he has been heard but seldom lately on the floor of the House. On the few occasions he has spoken, however, he struck me as a quick, generous, and impulsive man, strikingly handsome, and of a cast of features and carriage reminding one strongly of a *beau sabreur*—a man to head a victorious column, or to lead a forlorn hope in a desperate assault.

Mr. Cox, of New York, too, is a most distinguished speaker. He shines and sparkles, scintillates and shines. Every subject he touches turns to sunshine, and there is a warm spot in every new member's heart for him. May his "sun" never "set."

How well I remember the first speech I ever heard in these classic halls. It was just after my election, and consequently during the short session of the Forty-ninth Congress. The orator was well under way as I entered, and such impassioned fervor as his I never witnessed. Not confining himself to rhetoric, he displayed a physical energy that fairly fascinated me, for his arms and hands were going like the arms of a windmill. I was surprised to notice, however, that in spite of it all no one was paying the slightest heed to him. The gentleman in front of him was gracefully reposing with his feet upon his desk. His immediate neighbor was reading the New York *Herald*, his friend on the right was munching an apple, while the attention of the whole House was as little occupied with the speaker as if he were a fly buzzing in the northeast corner of the ceiling.

I was surprised at this; I was pained. It argued ill for my own career, since I was perfectly well convinced I could never get up a tithe of the steam this gentleman did. I must have shown my feelings on my countenance, too, for he caught my eye and held it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

like a drowning man a straw. From that moment he addressed his remarks solely to me. He even advanced upon me, increasing the vehemence of his gestures as he did so. I forget now the subject of his discourse; but I think it had to do with removing the tariff off peanuts. At any rate he was terrible in his earnestness, and his long locks rose and fell in sympathetic harmony with his gestures.

It was extremely embarrassing, however, to be thus singled out on my very first appearance, too; and at last to break the horrid spell he exercised upon me, I ducked behind the screen that circles the chamber. When I gained a safe retreat, I turned to an official who had considerately been acting as my guide. On expressing to him my astonishment that such animated oratory had met with such scant recognition, he smiled condescendingly; then as we passed out: "You won't be here long," he explained colloquially, "before you find that they'll be foaming at the mouth, and not a quarter of those on the floor will even know they're in town."

As regards speaking, or at least the first attempts at speaking by new men, I am reminded of a good story told in my hearing by a distinguished member of the British House of Commons. He had previously served as mayor of a large city and came to Parliament with a great reputation for oratory. On the eve of his maiden effort in the House he was approached by an elderly colleague, who, after explaining that every legislative body had its own little weaknesses, described that of Parliament to be a petty jealousy of reputations earned outside its own halls. "I know it's very trivial and absurd," went on the monitor, "but if you could only recognize this little prejudice and *just break down in your speech*, they'd feel very kindly towards you, and you'd gain by it later." Whether the same "little prejudices" have weight here I cannot say; but of this I am assured, namely, that a few days spent in Congress before taking one's seat are of great utility to the budding statesman. Not that he learns much, but he learns this most useful lesson—how little he does know. He gets permeated with the atmosphere of legislation, and there is just that much less for him to have to absorb when he comes up a full-fledged Congressman. There are fewer demands upon his time, and he has consequently the opportunity to study the workings of things and the men he will subsequently encounter. Some of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these men, however, he will not meet again, for members have been known to fail of re-election. Indeed, the present House has lost two noteworthy men in General Bragg and Colonel Hepburn. I remember them together, in connection with the Dependent Pension Bill.

What powers of debate they possessed: inspired invective in the one; stern, relentless, pitiless logic of retort in the other. General Bragg, in showing that he had the right to represent the soldier, sketched in glowing terms his own brilliant career, closing with a graphic picture of how, when he reviewed his troops, the cheer would be caught up from man to man, and the word roll down the lines that General Bragg was riding by.

"Yes," answered Colonel Hepburn, "and there was a time when Benedict Arnold rode down the line and received the well merited cheers of his men. Years after his desertion he met a former comrade in arms on British soil, and asked him what would be his (Benedict Arnold's) fate should he ever venture to return to America. 'Would the wound that I received at Saratoga in my leg save my life?' The reply was this: 'If we ever caught you on American soil, we would cut off the leg you so gloriously had wounded at Saratoga and we would bury it with all the honors of war; but as for your carcass, if we could only get hold of that, we'd hang it on the highest gibbet we could find.'"

The records of the war speak in too eloquent language of General Bragg's career to require any protest from my pen at the calumny of linking merely his name with that of Benedict Arnold.

But, how I am running on or rather running back. I began with the present Congress and here I am sticking at the Forty-ninth. Even as I write (for I am writing at my desk) a gentleman is "up." "Mr. Speaker," he is saying: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn." Then a vote is taken, next a division is demanded, and finally, if he has the requisite number of votes behind him, the ayes and noes are called. To call the ayes and noes consumes exactly thirty-six minutes. After the motion to adjourn has been voted down, he repeats the motion in a slightly different form, and the whole process is gone over again and very likely a third and even a fourth time. This is what is called "filibustering," and the gentleman employs these tactics quite legitimately to retard consideration of some bill he does not approve of.

The last and most extraordinary case of filibustering is that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the now famous deadlock. What excitement reigned when it first dawned upon us that the "Direct Tax bill" was to produce a night session, but how little we dreamed that the now memorable "4th" was to extend into a week. At the demand for a call of the House the great dome of the capital flashes with electric fire, and members hurriedly come flocking back. By midnight the House has assumed the appearance of a battle ground, with gentlemen stretched lifeless here and there over the seats and ottomans, vainly seeking rest. Every now and then the sergeant-at-arms would haul up before the bar of the House a "prisoner," and we would all rise up in a sort of general resurrection to chaff him—voting to fine him five thousand dollars, perhaps, asking who gave him his *boutonniere*, and remarking generally upon the attractiveness of "her society."

Sometimes the haul would consist of several gentlemen, and they would stand there like great recalcitrant school-boys caught playing truant. The most puzzling part of the whole performance was to know alongside of whom you would find yourself in the morning; thus you would take a place next to a Democrat and wake up alongside of a Republican. A good joke was played upon me the last night of the deadlock. I was sleeping in the lobby, and during my restless slumbers in some manner kicked off one of my boots. On being suddenly called, I slipped on what I supposed was my own shoe, for it was lying alongside of me, and rushed on to the floor to vote. As I gradually regained my senses I became aware of the fact that I was wearing the property of some one else, and was only given a cue by noticing a gentleman hopping about the floor on one foot in all the agony of a tight fit. It seems that he too had kicked off his shoe on retiring to a couch, and this being facetiously changed for mine, he had pulled it on in his hurried awakening. But the deadlock has been too fully discussed to warrant more than these brief references from me. We broke it by a small majority to adjourn.

An amusing illustration of how one is occasionally obliged to rely on others in questions one has had no time to consider appeared the other day in a Washington paper. Mr. A. approaches Mr. B. and inquires why he voted on a certain question in the affirmative. "I voted aye," was the answer, "because I saw Mr. C. vote aye, and I voted as he did because Mr. C. closely resembles my old Colonel in the war."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"That's an odd reason," the first speaker replied, somewhat puzzled.

"Not so odd as it might seem," was the retort. "I followed my old Colonel for four years, and he never led me during all that time into a single dangerous position."

The curious manner in which a majority will be had on a rising vote, and this majority melt into a minority when it comes to having one's vote recorded, was amusingly illustrated the other day, when the matter was under discussion of providing each member with a clerk. Practically Congress is becoming an unpaid Parliament. Of course, a man can live on his salary, and live well on it, but he can hardly afford to hire a clerk and meet all such demands on his purse as are necessary to be met if he contemplates a continuation in public life. To begin with, the mail of an average Congressman will mount up to forty letters a day, and if he answers all these in his own hand, he has just so much less time and energy to expend on his parliamentary duties. The Senate, with one-third the labor demanded of each member, had set the precedent of voting themselves such assistance; but somehow, when it came to having one's name recorded in black and white, the Republican phalanx in the House, which had been energetically supporting the measure, flopped around, and, making of necessity a virtue, voted against the proposal. Of course, we were all hugely disappointed, for we had expected the Republicans to pull the coveted chestnuts for us from the fire. They were too sharp. "I would rather be in the Fiftieth Congress without a clerk," said a gentleman who viewed the matter from a practical standpoint, "than see my successor enjoying the services of one in the Fifty-first." Probably he voiced the sentiment of the majority.

Leaving aside the question of one's correspondence, the attendance at the House is long and fatiguing, beginning, if you include committees, at ten and lasting often till past six. In addition, there are occasional night sessions, and certainly an average of four sub-committee meetings per week. These, combined with the preparation of reports and of speeches, visits to the different departments, and efforts to secure places for your constituents, make just thirty-four hours work for the twenty-four. How do you do it then? We don't do it; but the hardest thing to learn is what you can safest leave undone.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An old war-horse can tell to a nicety even when his presence in the House is required. "Is Mr. B. in his seat?" some one is said to have once inquired of a doorkeeper. "Certainly," answered the official. "But how do you know, you haven't looked." "I don't need to look," was the cynical reply, "for this is Mr. B.'s first term."

The continued presentation of cards, too, keep you in a lively state of distractedness. People send in for you on every conceivable pretext, and they always time their visits at the exact moment when you are most particularly engaged. "Three ladies in the waiting room and a constituent at each door," exclaims a neighbor of mine, pulling his hair in despair, and he goes on with a letter acknowledging a consignment of hay to be sold in Washington for a country neighbor, and this done amiably writes his autograph in the book of a page.

Sometimes people call you out to talk over their pension cases, and their tales would melt a heart of adamant.

One of the most touching is that of a man who seeks support from an ungrateful government because of having fallen from a tree during the war while picking cherries; that of another for having contracted rheumatism by sitting down on a cold, icy stone.

All these claims are listened to with deep sympathy and bills in many cases drawn up for their relief. And all the time you are being called upon to sign petitions, to put your name in autograph books and to answer questions you know nothing about; to see that you don't vote aye when you ought to vote no, and your ears ringing the while with the reading of bills, the calls of committees and the oft repeated expression "Mr. Speaker, I object," or "I want to say just here—" "The third reading and engrossment of the bill"—"Those in favor of," etc., etc., expressions that rise superior to the general buzz of conversation and unite in producing the noise of a vast factory, which is exactly what Congress is—a vast factory for the turning out of laws.

LLOYD S. BRYCE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THEORY OF AMERICAN GOVERNMENT.

THE village nestling at the foot of the hill, where I am now writing, contains a thousand inhabitants, and is the central neighborhood of a township of twenty-five hundred. The township, or town, as it is called, lies among the hills of Western Massachusetts, a thousand feet above the sea. It is six miles long and three broad, and is occupied chiefly for agriculture, there being only five or six small factories where cloth, paper and machinery are made. The total value of property, real and personal, placed upon the tax rolls is $2,670,000, rated at about sixty per cent. of its real value, which, therefore, must be near four and a half millions. The taxes for roads, bridges, schools and every other town, county and State expense, amount to a little less than one per cent. upon this assessed valuation. Thirty-nine persons only, including two sent to the State Insane Asylum, receive aid as paupers, twenty-nine of them but a partial support. The number of dwellings is 478, and of families about 500. So that nearly every family lives by itself, usually in a dwelling of its own, that is, a house with a garden, all owned by the head of the household. There is a public library of 6,000 volumes, where any resident may read as much as pleases him, and from which any tax-payer may, without charge, take books for reading at home. The number of volumes taken and retaken from the library during the year is 8,000, and not one has been lost in ten years.

There is a town-hall for town meetings; there are five school houses, one of them sheltering under the same roof a primary, intermediate and high school, and there are five churches of different denominations, two Congregational, one Episcopal, one Methodist and one Roman Catholic. The schools are free to all and books are provided for the scholars. A wooded hill is dedicated to the public, as a pleasure ground for all, rich and poor, young and old. The little community for its internal affairs is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

governed by the town-meeting, where every adult male who pays a tax, however small, has a voice ; that is to say, the town meeting is the legislative assembly of the town ; it is convened twice a year, and as much oftener as there may be occasion, and disposes of town affairs. The chief executive officers are three selectmen. There are but three federal officials in the town, and they are postmasters ; the only state officials are six justices, three notaries public and a deputy sheriff. The town is one of thirty-two towns in the county, which has a population of 74,000, and is itself a corporation, with corporate officers, for the management of its corporate affairs, though there is never a meeting of the citizens of the county. The county is one of fourteen counties in the state, which has 2,000,000 of inhabitants and a government of its own, and the state is one of the United States which have a population of 60,000,000 and a common government of all.

The functions of these different governments are set forth in written constitutions and statutes. The township is invested with power : To grant such sums as are judged necessary for the support of public schools, for the relief and employment of the poor, the making and repairing of highways and townways, the writing and publishing of town histories, for burial grounds, for the destruction of noxious animals, for necessary aid to disabled soldiers and sailors and their families and the families of the slain, for monuments to those who died in the service, for conveying pupils to and from the public schools, for procuring the arrest of criminals, for maintaining a free public library and reading-room, and for all other necessary charges arising in the town. The disbursement of these various sums of money and the superintendence of the business for which they are granted are functions of the town.

The cities are clothed with larger powers of municipal government. The government of the county is vested in county commissioners, whose powers are declared to be : To provide for erecting and repairing court-houses, jails, and other necessary public buildings, for the use of their counties ; to represent their county, and have the care of its property and the management of its business and concerns in all cases not otherwise specially provided for.

The state having been originally sovereign and as such joining the confederation, retains all the powers of sovereignty not conceded by its own people to the common government of all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the states, as expressed in the Constitution of the Union. The State Government is divided into three departments—legislative, executive, and judicial. The first is vested in two houses, Senate and Representatives; the second in a Governor, all being chosen annually, the members of the Legislature by districts, and the Governor by the whole people. The powers conceded to the United States are thus described in the Federal Constitution, a description which I give in the very words of the instrument, because they have been so often misunderstood and so often misrepresented.

"To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debt and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; to borrow money on the credit of the United States; to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States and with the Indian tribes; to establish an uniform rule of naturalization and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcy throughout the United States; to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures; to provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States; to establish post-offices and post-roads; to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries; to constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court, to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations; to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the Legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards and other needful buildings; and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

The powers of this federal government are divided between three departments, legislative, executive and judicial; the legislative consisting of the two houses of Congress, the executive of the President, and the judicial of the Supreme and inferior courts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It would lead me too far from my present purpose to discuss more particularly the boundary between the national and the state governments. That is a subject so vast in its reach and so momentous in its results, that it needs a treatise by itself. My aim now is to point out, if I can, the theory on which all American government, state and national, rests, without dwelling upon the partition of sovereignty between the or parts upon the ramifications of local rule, all which like the trunk, branches and leaves of a tree, make up the great figure, as it stands and sways to and fro in calm and storm, sunshine and shadow. For the present it is enough to say, that the general idea of the state and federal governments and of the relations between them is, that the latter has charge of the relations of each state with the others and of all with foreign nations, the former has charge of the relations between its own citizens.

This is a bird's-eye view of the little community which I began by describing, and of all the communities of which in successive gradations it forms a part. Judged by its results, displayed on so small a theatre, I should say, that the political system of this little community is, with one exception, not necessary now to be discussed, as nearly perfect as it can be made. Every human being has shelter, clothing, food, and instruction; all adult males have a voice in the management of what is common to all the people, and for the larger concerns which they have in common with the county, state or nation, they have their representatives in every deliberative assembly.

How did all this come about? It came naturally. It was not imposed by violence, it was not effected by fraud. We know every degree of the process. Self-government is as natural in the new world as is chieftainship in the old. We know every step in our own history. We know who first and who afterwards came hither, when they came and whence they came and what they did when here.

The settlements which most of all laid the foundations of American government were made in New England.

The first of these settlements occurred at Plymouth and the second in Massachusetts Bay. The Plymouth settlers coming without royal patent or other authority than their own high resolve, when they were about to land, entered into a solemn compact with one another, by which in the presence of God they combined themselves together into a civil body politic, by virtue of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which they were to enact such just and equal laws from time to time as should be thought most convenient for the general good of the colony.

In making this compact each man acted for himself alone and as the equal of every other man. Equality of rights, absolute equality, was thus the first principle upon which the new government rested. As other settlements were made in the Plymouth Colony, each followed the example of the parent one, and when a conference of the different settlements became necessary delegates were sent chosen by the body of each community of settlers. The colony of Massachusetts Bay was formed under an English charter, but this charter intrusted the government of the colony to the freemen of the company without distinction. Thus it was that equality became the corner stone in the foundation of New England freedom.

It were needless to trace the progress of this principle in the different colonies. In some of them there were exceptions, but the exceptions proved the rule. In taking for an example a township in Massachusetts, it must not be understood that the same system of local government existed in all the colonies. In its most perfect form it was found only in New England. But in all the colonies there was some form of local government, sometimes in parishes or other small divisions. The general features were the same. When, therefore, the united colonies put forth the Great Declaration which proclaimed their independence of the British crown and gave the reasons for it, they put the equality of mankind at the head and front of their argument. "We hold," they said, "these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

This word "equal" is the pivot upon which the argument turns; the words "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" follow from it; they are amplifications of the same general idea. For if two are equal in rights, neither can justly interfere with the other by taking away his life or restraining him of his liberty, or obstructing his pursuit of happiness, so long as such pursuit does not interfere with the equal rights of another.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This great declaration has been accepted from that time to this as a just explanation of the theory of American government. More famous and far-reaching than Magna Charta, for while the work at Runnymede concerned only the people of England, the work in the Pennsylvania hall concerned all mankind, the declaration was welcomed with rejoicing as the signal of deliverance from the despotisms of ages. It has gone the circuit of the world, outlived dynasties and revolutions, and is as full of life to-day as it was in the dark days of 1776.

But why this recital? Is it not commonplace? Have we not heard it all before? Yes, indeed, it has been heard a thousand times, repeated in school books, declaimed by school boys, read out by Fourth of July orators from platforms innumerable. But has it been believed? Has it been accepted in its full significance? Commonplace it may be to scholars and thinkers; but to many a declaimer, aye, to many a legislator, it must sound as new and strange doctrine.

Let us, however, not make the mistake of confounding cause with concomitant, the reason of government with the conditions on which it should be founded. Equality is not an end but a means. If each person stood isolated, though he were the equal of every other person he would be useless and miserable. Equality of itself will not insure happiness. That is obtained by pursuit. Is it not the province of government to promise happiness to any one. That he must pursue for himself. His right to the pursuit is defended by government. The great men who formulated and proclaimed the Declaration of Independence knew very well on what foundation a state should be built, for they were themselves representatives of political societies long established, which had administered justice, mustered troops and engaged in many public enterprises. They knew as well as we know, out of what instincts and for what ends governments had been maintained in the colonies for nearly two hundred years. When, therefore, they spoke of equality they spoke of it, not as an end, but a means; not as the reason for having a government, but as the only just condition on which it was to be had and enjoyed. They meant that governments were instituted for the protection of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that preliminary to all was the great primal truth, that these several functions were to be exercised with equal reference to all the inhabitants of the state. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theory is set forth in their own words, not in some of them only, but in all. Knowing the rights to be secured, we know that the means to secure them are: just and equal laws, the administration of justice, the public defense, the education of children, the construction of public works necessary for the common service, and the care of those feeble members of the state who are unable to take care of themselves. If there be any means of securing men's rights, other than these, I know not what they are. There is no occasion to revise the formula of the fathers. It is as true now as it was when it was first proclaimed. That generation has passed away, other generations have appeared and departed; old dynasties have been overthrown and new ones established, peoples have been divided and reunited, but the same truths remain; events do not alter them, time does not make them dim; they shine like the stars of the firmament, unchanged and unchangeable. Here is the American political creed. The rights for which government is instituted are set forth; the condition of ample enjoyment is given and the means are shown. Let us consider these means a little more closely to see how they may be best enjoyed, by adhering to the condition of equal rights for all.

Nobody here doubts the wisdom of just and equal laws. When it is said that laws are to be enacted for the common good, it is not meant that there is a common store of good, distinct from the separate share of each individual. If a measure were certain to make half the individual members of the state five times richer than they are and the other half poorer by one-fifth of their substance, the sum total would be nearly six-fold what it now is, but the measure after all would be robbery of half the people to enrich the other half.

So, too, of laws for the public defense; they may be perverted into instruments of injustice. A navy yard, for example, placed not where ships can be best built and easiest sent to sea, but where jobbers want contracts and politicians want votes, would be a yard with a double aspect, one for defense and the other for plunder.

When we find ourselves perplexed by contradictory theories or measures, it is useful to go back to first principles. The proper place of charity in the functions of government is a subject for careful discrimination. The end of government is not the development of man's social nature, but the maintenance of his rights,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the rights which God and nature gave him. His social nature develops itself, or is best developed by the affections and those ties which bind every man and woman born into the world. Government is a political machine, not a charitable institution. Association in political society is a different thing from association for companionship. The companionship of man and wife, for example, is an ordinance of nature, because each is imperfect without the other. This leads, of necessity, to the association of parent and child, and the multifold relations of kinship. These relations, however, weaken as they widen, and become commingled with like relations crossing in different directions. A father of a family sees his children and his grandchildren clustering around him, but they entwine themselves also with the descendants of other parents and grandparents, and the identity of blood is lost in two or three generations.

So the relations which arise from affinity or consanguinity may be left out of view, when considering relations that are political. Every man feels the necessity of some association for the better development of his own individuality. He needs the aid of his neighbor for defense against evil-disposed persons, hence a union for common defense; he needs a road from his dwelling to one at a distance, and hence agrees with his neighbor that they should build one together; he must cross a river, and being unable alone to build a bridge he unites with another to build it; and so in other enterprises for the benefit of many, which the many must undertake in common. The aim, however, of all these common undertakings is the same, the benefit of the individuals who join them. The danger of these public works is favoritism to the few at the expense of the many.

The tendency to govern too much has in most governments no counteracting force to set against it, and only when those who govern and those who are governed are identical can the tendency to govern overmuch be overcome. In an unlimited monarchy the counteracting force is fear, the fear of encountering resistance. The autocrat has only to wish and to gratify his wishes, excepe that nature sets bounds to his desires on one side, and fear of going too far interposes on the other. In a limited monarchy, the number of those who govern is multiplied, and as they are also among the governed, they restrain themselves to the extent of protecting their own interests. Thus it has happened in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countries where the power is in the hands of the landlords, that the laws favor the landed interests. When, however, all have a hand in making the laws, they will be made for all, unless the general movement is obstructed or deflected by interested combinations.

Experience shows us that there is an ever-pressing tendency of majorities to exert their power, and thence arises the necessity of an ever vigilant watchfulness to restrain them. Two maxims are often heard in arguments about governments: one, "that which is best administered is best," the other "the best government is that which governs least." Both contain some wisdom, but neither is altogether true. A bad government may be faithfully administered, and yet, from defects in its constitution, it may work a great deal of harm; it may attempt to do too much; it may be obliged to do more than ought to be done by any government. For example, it was for a long time, and may be still, the system of France that a mill cannot be run without a license from the central government. In the administration of this government the license may be prudently and justly dispensed, but the rule that requires a license at all is a bad one. So with regard to the other maxim, a government may do too little; it may neglect to make adequate provision for the dispensation of justice or for the national defense. It is true, nevertheless, that a just application of our political creed would exclude very much of our legislation. The true end of government is to secure men's rights, not their fortunes or their pleasures.

The justification for any public enterprise is to be found in its tendency to secure some of the rights for which government is instituted. Every one of the eighteen clauses in which the powers granted to the Federal Government are expressed rests for its justification upon the principle I have stated. And though there be this difference between the Federal and the State constitutions, that while the former enumerates the powers granted the latter enumerates the powers withheld, there is implied in every State constitution a limitation of State power to the protection of the rights of the people. I do not say that an act of a State legislature not prohibited by the Federal or the State constitution, might be declared by the courts to be invalid. The powers of the State judiciary may in this respect be limited to declaring the inconsistency between two expressed laws and upholding the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greater as against the less. But I none the less affirm, that an act of a state legislature, which goes beyond the protection of the rights of the citizens and the sanction of those public enterprises which, being beyond the power of the individual, are really connected with his protection, passes the just limits of government as measured either by the lessons of reason or the precepts of the fathers.

There are two theories of government, the liberal and the meddlesome. Their limits are easily marked, if we follow the principle we have been considering. My life, my liberty, my pursuit of my own happiness are my inalienable rights. So are those of every other person. That all these may be enjoyed together, in harmony, is the aim of civil society. But in so much as there are many works which would promote individual happiness, to which, however, the abilities of one alone are unequal, many individuals unite in an enterprise for their common benefit. A road, as I have said, is one instance. Savages have no roads or next to none. One finds his way in the wilderness, over plains and hills, and another seeing the traces of his footsteps follows, and a path or trail is made through the forests or over the prairie. A civilized society makes a road, because a road is a convenience to every traveler, and all of them unite to survey and make it. This is but a sample of many works useful for the public, that is for the individuals who compose it, and therefore undertaken by the public. The individual is always the object in view. His protection in the full enjoyment of all his rights is the great object of all laws, of all institutions. Whenever society attempts to do more than this it oversteps its proper boundaries. So certainly is it a law of our nature, that we should not pass these limits, all history teaches us, that wherever we do pass them, we suffer sooner or later. The meddlesome theory leads to irritation, failure, reaction. Most certainly we promote our own individual happiness best when we mind our own business most.

There are many reasons why public charities should be watched. The temptation to feign distress is so great, the weight of idleness is so heavy, the pretense of helplessness is so common, that when the state interferes it does so for the most part in a manner so imperfect and with such wasteful extravagance that one could almost wish it were not undertaken at all. Yet food, clothing, and shelter must be provided for those who want and cannot by their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own efforts get them. Why we provide them is because a sympathetic nature has been implanted in the human soul. We cannot see a drowning man, but we rush to the rescue; we cannot look upon a burning building without striving to save the inmates; the monks of St. Bernard live in regions of ice, that they may help the way-worn and bewildered traveler. While this is our nature and we yield to the impulse, our faculty of reason admonishes us that the necessity is at once the cause and the limit of interference. No man should be helped who can help himself. Self-help is the best lesson for the poor and rich alike to learn. No great character was ever yet found without it, and with it few there are who fall by the wayside.

The administration of justice is of primal necessity in all social organizations. To be equal before the law is the aspiration and the aim of man under governments the most diverse. Some one has said, and I think it was Hume, that all the machinery of the state, all the apparatus of the system and its varied workings, end in simply bringing twelve good men into a box to decide upon their oaths. To be equal, the administration of the law must affect all alike, must be equally within the reach of the poor and the rich, the weak and the powerful, the friendless and the befriended, and equally open to the knowledge of all.

The education of children and the care of those who are destitute are clearly within the scope of equal government; the reasons for them are not merely economical, they are vital. Self-preservation requires them. By education I mean only such culture of the mind and such an amount of learning as will teach all learners their duties and their rights, and make them capable of holding their own in the world.

The strongest of all the seductive influences which lead men astray from the simplicity of the early faith, and the frugality of the early times, is the tendency to extravagance in public expenditure. In devising the means of levying the largest contributions in order to fill the treasury, and then of emptying the treasury that it may be filled again, the tempter and the tempted vie with each other. Having thus discussed the means by which the rights for which governments are instituted are best secured, let us recur to the condition on which all these means are to be used and these rights secured. What is meant by equality? Men are not equal in stature or in strength of body or mind, or in genius, or in elevation of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spirit. There has been but one Shakespeare, but one Washington. Equality means equality in rights, in the right to live, the right to be free, the right to pursue one's own happiness, in his own way, without constraint from another, and as a necessary consequence equality in all those agencies of government by which these results are accomplished. The individual stands alone before his maker. He came into the world alone; he goes into the grave alone. "We brought nothing into this world, and we can carry nothing out." While we are here, we stand each by himself, accountable to God alone for the inner life, and to our fellow men only so far as we infringe their rights, which they have in equal measure with ourselves.

Were there occasion to fortify the lessons of our history and the teaching of the Fathers, by reasoning from man's nature, it would be easy. Self-knowledge and self-control are the hardest of all tasks. "Know thyself" is the precept of ancient sages. If self-knowledge and self-control be so difficult, how much more difficult are the knowledge and control of others. What person is there who should not say to himself, what candid person is there who would not say, I am ignorant and weak, I can see but a step before me; I thought one thing last year, I think a different thing this year; I was headstrong yesterday, I am irresolute to-day; how then can I, so weak myself, be strong enough to control another? If I cannot wisely govern myself, how dare I attempt to govern my neighbor?

There is no more fascinating study than to trace to its logical consequences this great doctrine of equal rights. The first of these consequences is religious peace. The belief in equal rights relegates to the domain of conscience that which should never have been admitted within the domain of government, and lifts from the world the dark and heavy cloud which has hung over it like a pall from the beginning of human records. The assumed insight into the unseen world, the dreadful power to bind or to unloose the souls of the departed, the propitiation of good and evil divinities, which the priesthood so long arrogated to itself, when supported by the secular arm filled the world with terror. Whether the rites were celebrated by Druids in British forests or by priests offering human sacrifices in Mexican temples, or by bishops in grand cathedrals, the spirit of domination was the same. It cost ages of cruel strife to implant in the minds of men

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the belief that the relation between each of them and his Maker was a personal relation, within whose sacred precincts no other man was privileged to enter. The equality of men was the foundation on which the belief came finally to rest, and that equality being once established the sword fell from the girdle of religion and the robe of peace took its place. It is the reasonable and lofty boast of this, our country, that it has made religious freedom a reality at last, and established in our federal constitution the immutable decree that Congress shall "make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," and the like in our State constitutions, that of New York containing these memorable words: "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed in this State to all mankind." Wherever now and in all time to come, the standard of the Republic is planted, there is and ever shall be religious peace. The next consequence of the belief in equal rights is its antagonism to the theory of hereditary government; a theory which has spread itself over the older continents save here and there a few heroic exceptions, as for instance behind the defenses of the Swiss mountains. What could be more absurd than the superstition that wisdom descends from father to son, in endless succession, unless it be that other superstition that the weak son of a born ruler could govern better than the elect of the people. Both these superstitions have gone down, in the New World, at least; for in all the vast domain which the foresight and daring of Columbus revealed to mankind, there stands not an hereditary ruler, outside of the empire of Brazil; a hundred millions who believe in equal rights against twelve millions who do not. I leave out of view the colonies which still remain subject to European thrones. Think of the uproar with which the world has resounded in the struggles of rival chieftains from the first battle on the plains of Asia to the last raid of Don Carlos in the fastnesses of Biscay; of the dungeons that have resounded with the cries of imprisoned patriots; of the fusi[1]ades and the scaffolds which have made the world red, of the implacable hatred with which a revolt against a dynasty has been pursued and punished after it has been suppressed; count the assassinations of heirs to thrones, and the cruelties of pretenders to thrones; and then think what the abandonment of hereditary government may do for the world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Still another logical consequence of the belief in equal rights is the overthrow of privilege. Of all the forms of oppression with which the spirit of evil has afflicted mankind the greatest is privilege. It has stolen slaves from the coasts of Guinea, divided into castes the millions of India, built up the gigantic monopolies which fetter the industry and commerce of the world, and given birth to those swarms of lesser immunities which darken the land, like the cloud of locusts that came up on the east wind from the coasts of Egypt, and ate every herb of the land and all the fruit of the trees. Freedom to labor in any form of handicraft, to till the land, to engage in any calling, to buy or sell, when, where and how he may, is the birthright of every human being, derived from the Almighty, and however some may revile it, victory will come over to its side at last, and the hosts of monopoly great and small will be driven away into outer darkness.

A further consequence of the belief in equal rights is the stop which it must put to the career of conquest. The past history of the world has been a history of invasions, cruel and causeless invasions, one king warring against another king to get away his subjects, with no more regard to the rights or the wishes of the subjects themselves than if they were so many cattle grazing in the pastures, to be sold at the caprice of the owner, or stolen by the first and strongest robber. With the fall of the right of conquest would melt away the armaments by which the old world is trodden under foot, armaments which are never marshaled but to conquer or to resist conquest.

Thus has it been my aim to show in its just proportions the theory of this our American government, to recount the rights which it guarantees, and the means by which the guaranty is to be secured, and to show how there runs through all the idea of equal rights, with its softening and warming influence to smooth the way and lighten the burden of all the children of men.

This is our ideal commonwealth, as we love to see it, in the histories of early times and the constitutions of the States and Union; a true democracy; not a wild, untamed, disorderly democracy, but a democracy of order and of law. It is not necessary to such a form of government that the people should act in mass, as they may act by delegation in all but their primary assemblies. The principle and the effect are the same. The formula of the Constitution of New York expresses in just terms the theory and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the practice: "The people of the state of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows." In no other way than by delegation can the collective will manifest itself in a populous state. The people cannot in general assembly enact the laws, or hear evidence and decide upon law or fact, or chase a fugitive, or inflict punishment. They act by their agents and signify their choice by the innumerable leaflets, no bigger than a linnet's wing, which decide the destinies of states. There is a too prevalent notion that in proportion as officials are elected by direct votes of the people in that proportion the government is democratic; or to express it differently, the more election the more democracy. This is a mistake. The most democratic of the old governments was in Connecticut, and there the freemen elected annually the Governor and the Legislature, and the legislature appointed all the magistrates, judicial and executive, from the judges and sheriffs to the justices of the peace. Before the last revision of its State Constitution the government of Massachusetts was administered by a Governor and Council elected annually by the people, and by a Senate and House of Representatives elected in the same way and for the same term, and the supreme judges and other officials were appointed by the Governor and Council, the judges for life, and the other officials for fixed terms of office. Now many of the executive offices are filled by popular vote. But the State Government is no more democratic than it was before, and no better administered. Connecticut, as I have said, was no less democratic in the old days than it is in these, when the members of the Legislature are elected for two years, and hold biennial sessions, and the judges are appointed by the Legislature for long terms of office. The experience of New York is full of significance. When first adopted the Constitution of the State provided for filling by popular election the offices in charge of the canals and the State-prisons. The Constitution has been amended, and both these branches of administrative service are now filled by the Governor, on the advice of the Senate. If the truth must be told, the filling of so many administrative offices by popular election tends to weaken the hold of the people upon these offices, by distracting the attention of the electors and smuggling into place unknown and incompetent holders.

There are some Americans, I am sorry to say, not very many I hope, but ignorant and noisy, who repudiate the principle on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which the government of their country is founded, scoff at the inalienable rights of man, mistake the abuses for the uses of our institutions, and think and speak of Europe as a fairer land with more benign institutions. These are illegitimate children of the Republic. They labor in vain. The doctrine of equal rights for all the children of the common Father will not be shaken till the earth trembles to its foundations.

Such is the theory of American Government, that ideal of American democracy, which I set about to give. I have confined myself to this ideal. I have not attempted to show wherein or how widely the practice departs from the theory; how much, if at all, the real lags behind the ideal. I have endeavored to portray this ideal as it yet lingers in tradition and may be traced in the pages of the Fathers; the ideal of a self-balanced and self-governed state, where every man stands erect in the fullness of his rights, and the pride of his manhood, neither cringing nor overbearing, owing no allegiance but of duty, claiming none but from the heart, fulfilling every service and exercising every right of the citizen. This, I am fain to think, is the true ideal of American government; a government founded not on the traditions of remote ages, not on usurpation, not on conquest, but on things older and firmer than all—the equality and brotherhood of men.

DAVID DUDLEY FIELD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REASONS FOR ACCEPTING THE PRESIDENCY.

HEADQUARTERS ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *June* 21, 1868.

DEAR SHERMAN:

Your kind favor written from New Mexico is received. You understand my position exactly. It is one I would not occupy for any mere personal consideration, but from the nature of the contest since the close of active hostilities, I have been forced into it in spite of myself. I could not back down without, as it seems to me, leaving the contest for power for the next four years between mere trading politicians, the elevation of whom, no matter which party won, would lose to us largely the results of the costly war which we have gone through. Now the Democrats will be forced to adopt a good platform, and put upon it a reliable man who, if elected, will disappoint the copperhead element of their party. This will be a great point gained, if nothing more is accomplished. I feel very grateful to the officers of our Army, whose military achievements made my reputation as well as their own, to know that they support me in this new field. I do not expect, or want, active support, but merely the satisfaction of knowing what your letter assures me of on your part. Officers who expect to make the Army their home for life have to serve under successive Administrations and should not make themselves obnoxious to any party likely ever to come into power.

I shall not ask you to come to Washington until after November, and probably not then. For myself I expect to be away from here most of the time, but I shall keep within telegraph, and being within the limits of my command will exercise it.

Present my kindest regards to Mrs. Sherman and the children.

Yours truly,

U. S. GRANT.

A true copy of the original now in my possession.

W. T. SHERMAN,
General.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1888.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GERMANY'S RIGHT TO ALSACE.

THE American who returns from a tour in Europe, after turning his attention not only to nature and art, but to the political relations of the older hemisphere, must bring home a vivid impression of the serious dangers which threaten the peace of Europe. The most serious of these dangers is the well-nigh unendurable tension in the relations between France and Germany. This takes the form, in France, of a passionate bitterness against the victor of 1870—an intense longing pervading all classes of the community, to overthrow the treaty of Frankfort and to reopen the struggle for revenge. To this stands opposed in Germany a clear, calm resolve to hold firm the victor's prize of the great war, and to defend it, if need be, with sacrifices of every sort. The other great questions which agitate Europe would in all probability be settled in peaceful fashion by the peoples standing in such sore need of peace, if this embittered antagonism between France and Germany did not contain within itself fuel enough to produce, on the first occasion, a general explosion.

The question then may readily force itself upon the American who contemplates the situation of Europe without prejudice and in a friendly spirit, whether the victor of 1871 did not carry his demands to an excess fraught with the greatest danger to the entire continent and eventually to Germany itself. This view has found expression in the German Parliament. Socialistic Deputies have repeatedly declared that the constant danger of war, the consequent ever-increasing burdens of taxation, and the pressure of a military system are a results of the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine.

It is, however, certain that grief over the loss of two provinces is not the factor of prime importance in the feelings of the French.

The cry in the name of which a new struggle at arms is demanded is not the liberation of the provinces incorporated against their own will in the German Empire, but revenge, as such, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in its own name. And he who is in any degree conversant with the French national character will cherish no doubt that the disposition of France would be the same, though Germany in the year 1871 had foregone all increase of territory.

The story is told that Thiers met with Ranke at Vienna in the winter of 1870–71, and, in a conversation upon the political situation sought to convince the German historian that as the war owed its beginning to the Empire, it had, in all reason, reached its end at the Empire's downfall. On the same occasion the French statesman is said to have addressed to Ranke the inquiry: "Against whom are you still fighting?" and to have received the reply: "Against Louis XIV." And, in fact, no one who surveys the history of Europe since the Reformation can fail to recognize that the effort to crush foreign nationalities by violence, and to establish French supremacy without regard to consequences, though it found in the "great monarch" its mightiest embodiment, ought yet to be ascribed, not to this or that ruler of France, but to the French people. This tendency has remained the same through all the changes of rule in France. The armies of the Revolution strove to carry out the ideas of the Revolution by force in all lands, and this spirit of violent propaganda was taken advantage of by the great Son of the Revolution in forming the plans of his ambition. Nothing less than the overbearing spirit, so deeply rooted in the French character, made it possible for Napoleon to erect upon the collapse of the old States his outrageous despotism.

The right of nations to select for themselves, without reference to outside powers, that form of constitution corresponding to their nature has never found recognition in France. Prussia had no sooner laid the foundations of a new Germany in 1866 than French Chauvinism saw in the Prussian successes an unpardonable insult to French honor. But how could a people, which from 1866 to 1870 was shrieking revenge for Sadowa, have forgiven Sedan, although the victor had attained no increase of territory? The German victory of 1870 made the probability of a second war so great that it became the first task of German statecraft to give to the military position of Germany the greatest possible strength.

The annexation of the fortress Metz with the French-speaking population lying about it, sprang, as Prince Bismarck has him-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self over and over openly declared, exclusively from strategic grounds.

As regards Alsace, however, and German Lorraine, *i. e.*, as regarded by far the larger part of the region annexed in 1871, there came into view, by the side of strategic considerations, national grounds of the first importance.

The French claim to Alsace was robbery, accomplished at a time when Germany, owing to the break-up of its political organization, was incapable of defending its own territory. Upon the soul of the freshly-established and mighty empire the expiation of this ancient grievance fell as a national duty of the most pressing character.

True, the labor of French statesmanship for two hundred years had not been without fruit. Alsace, at the moment of its annexation, had become French, not only externally, but with heart and soul. The entire population, with few exceptions, expressed itself in passionate protest against the provisions of the peace of Frankfort. It is precisely this circumstance which makes it difficult for the citizens of a democratic republic to approve the annexation of 1871. Yet there could be no greater mistake than to refer the differences in the judgments passed upon this act to the contrast between the monarchial and democratic ideas. Every sound conception of the state, in the republic no less than in the monarchy, must regard the nation as a unity, and as thereby precluded from according to each member of the body the right to determine at pleasure its own political form.

The assumption that not only the people as a whole but every part of the people is sovereign would lead to anarchy. Republican governments have defended with the greatest energy the unity of the state against desires for separation. Switzerland defeated the League of Separation by force of arms, and the United States held the Southern States in the Union through struggles prolonged through years. The only question, then, to be discussed, in an ethical judgment upon the annexation, is this: "Was the population of Alsace in 1871 still to be regarded as German?" A foreigner who looks at the political temper of the Alsatians is, in general, inclined to give a negative answer to this question. And, indeed, nothing seems more incomprehensible than the passionate opposition of an integral part of a nation to which the highest and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most precious right—the right to its own nationality—has been restored.

But one must remember that Alsace has been united with France for 200 years, and that she has lived through the entire period of the development of modern history as a part of France. The storms of the Revolution have blown through the land, and have swept away the German recollections as the autumn wind sweeps away withered leaves. The conspicuous military ability of the Alsatians has brought to them a rich participation in the military laurels of the First Empire. The potent centralization, which sways not only the political but also the intellectual life of France, has prostrated the spirit and soul of the people of Alsace. The ambitious elements have been constrained, in consequence of this centralization, to subject themselves to the sway of French customs. He who felt that he had in himself the stuff to achieve something in diplomacy, or in literature, or in art, was obliged to journey to Paris. Ever since the beginning of this century, it has been the exception for an Alsatian to study at a German University, while but few educated Alsatians could be found who had not spent at Paris, at least, a part of those youthful years which fix the character for life.

At all times, in the contact of German and French civilizations, the latter has gained a certain superiority. The German spirit is deeper than the French, more eager to solve by ever repeated effort the great fundamental problems of life. But the French possess a far greater talent for form. They tolerate more readily superficiality than obscurity of expression, and are unwearied in their effort to give to each thought an expression in which it can be grasped by every one and become the common property of all educated men. An extraordinary logical dexterity is united among the French with unsurpassed elegance. Hence the French are without doubt more likeable than the Germans. German friendship is perhaps firmer and more valuable than French friendship, but French social intercourse is incomparably more graceful and charming than social life among the Germans. It is to their gift for form that the French are indebted for an influence upon the intellectual development of Germany to which the innate worth of their ideas would never have entitled them. The classical period of German literature was forced to begin with a war for independence, waged against

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the French spirit. Frederick the Great considered the German speech and the German literature barbaric; he wrote his prose and verse in French, and he could give no better advice to Germans, in respect to literature, than to imitate French models. It was necessary for Lessing to overthrow by his unsparing criticism the art theories of Voltaire, before "Götz von Berlichingen" and the "Sorrows of Werther" could be created. In our own century, as well, which began with the liberation of Germany from the political and literary supremacy of France, it is equally true that the political theories and the literary currents in France have had a potent influence upon Germany. These are facts in the psychology of nations which, though we may lament, we cannot dispute, and which can become changed only gradually through the political unity and the unfolding of the power of Germany. What indeed is more easy to comprehend than that German Alsace, in its political union with France, should have taken on French customs? In Alsace to-day the German language is, we may almost say, only known in the form of a dialect, while all higher subjects of thought are discussed in French.

The question now arises: "Have the Alsatians, in virtue of the experiences through which they have passed, ceased to be Germans?" By no means. Who would venture to call Frederick the Great a Frenchman because he wrote his prose and verse in French? The true soul of a people, the characteristic principle of its individuality, may remain unimpaired though a foreign civilization has, for a time, gained the mastery over that people. The population of Alsace, with the exception of the cultivated classes, in its thoughts, words, feelings, is purely German. The records of the struggles which the Alsatians and the people of German Lorraine have maintained for the retention of their language lie open to every one's view. They furnish the picture of a serious, capable people which defends itself with despair against the extirpation of its mother-tongue.

In a petition which was addressed, in 1868, to the Emperor Napoleon by the people of German-Lorraine, we read as follows: "O, sir! How many fathers and mothers of families who earn their bread in the sweat of their brow impose upon themselves the pious, but none the less heavy, duty of teaching their children the Catechism in German by abridging in the winter evenings their own needful hours of sleep." In 1869, a radical journal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was established by prominent republicans of Mülhausen in the intent to propagate agitation against the Empire among the laboring circles. This paper appeared only in the German language, and justified this course in the following words : " Because the majority, yes the very large majority, of the Alsatian people is German in thought, in feeling, in speech ; receives its religious instruction in German ; loves and lives according to German usages, and will not forget the German language !"

In those realms of the intellectual life, especially, which touch most deeply the soul of a people, has the German nature of Alsace resisted the acceptance of a foreign form. In cultivated circles, too, which are under the influence of religious feeling, the drift of sentiment has been that German Christianity at least must be retained. The most distinguished Catholic pulpit orator of Alsace in this country, Abbé Mühe, who died in 1865, was able only once in his life to bring himself to preach in French ; and Canon Cazeau, of Strassburg Cathedral, published, three years before the annexation, an " Essai sur la conservation de la langue Allemande en Alsace," in which, in the interest of religion and morals, he energetically resisted the attempt to extirpate the German speech.

It is true, indeed, that the Rationalistic element among the Protestants had gained the ascendancy under the French rule, and that these were, and still remain, French in their sympathies. Rousseau and Voltaire stand higher in their estimation than Luther and Spener. But the Evangelical Protestant community remained, even up to the annexation, in spiritual fellowship with the Fatherland of the Reformation, and in numerous pastors' houses of Alsace, the genuine air of home is wafted upon the visitor from the German Fatherland. This, at all events, is certain : The proper mother-tongue of a people is that in which it *prays*. If the French journalists who travel through the country and send to Havre inflammatory reports of the popular feeling would visit, not alone restaurants, cafés, and promenades, but would also occasionally plant their foot in an Alsatian village church, they would receive impressions which would astonish but at the same time would greatly enlighten them.

It must then be admitted that the German Empire fitted again, in 1871, a member into its organism which had been severed from it by force. If there is any political principle amenable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alike to nature, morals, and reason, it is the principle of nationality, the victories of which are the great events of our century. The French have never, it is true, accepted this principle, but, when they wished to give a ground for that boundary of their territory acceptable to them, have preferred to derive this ground from geography. Under the term "natural boundary," the left bank of the Rhine has been from 1815 to 1870 demanded, some times covertly, sometimes openly. But nothing is less a "natural boundary" than a stream. The dwellers along its water-course are not thereby separated, but rather united. Even the Atlantic Ocean is a link between America and Europe. A river-valley always forms a geographical unity. He who has made a tour on foot along the ridge of the Vosges Mountains from the sources of the Saar as far as Ballon d'Alsace will not remain in doubt as to the natural boundary between France and Germany.

It is a question of the future whether the task which Germany has undertaken through the annexation of Alsace shall be accomplished with more or less difficulty, at a period more or less remote. Certain it is that the time of accomplishment is still distant, as long as the majority of the population in the provinces annexed endures only with obstinate reluctance the German rule. For the essence of the national state requires that the relations of obedience and appurtenance towards it be felt as a necessity by all classes of the population. Germany must, therefore, give to Alsace and to Lorraine German civilization, and the sense of membership in the German state. The measures for the accomplishment of this task cannot be of interest in a foreign country, nor can they be intelligently judged in the distance. The purpose of these lines is only this : to confirm well-disposed and unprejudiced Americans in the view that the present boundary line between France and Germany has been fixed, not by the sentence of a haughty victor, but in accordance with principles of justice and reason.

FREDERICK CURTIUS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN SHIPPING—THE DISEASE AND THE REMEDY.

THE statement that a nation possessing command of the cheapest and most efficient means of transportation, not only between internal points but to foreign ports, has a decided advantage in any struggle for supremacy, is too axiomatic to require discussion.

While the United States undoubtedly enjoys the cheapest freight rates and the most luxurious appliances for both railroad and steamboat travel known to the world, with a greater extent of mileage than is found in any other country, the state of our merchant marine during the last thirty years presents no ground for national pride, and the general conviction that a grave economic mistake has been made may give interest to a statement of the main facts and theories bearing on the subject.

The successful termination of our Revolution left us a loosely-organized country, hardly worthy of being called a nation. England, just beaten in an appeal to arms, purposed retaining us in the position of exporters of raw produce by aid of the concentrated capital and manufacturing appliances she possessed. The consequent impoverishment, with a growing tendency to lawlessness, was stopped by the wise measures inaugurated by Hamilton and seconded by Washington, which resulted in the adoption of our Constitution and the inauguration of Washington as President on May 30, 1789.

The second and third laws, passed July 4th and 20th of that year, under the preamble "Whereas, it is necessary for the support of government, for the discharge of debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares and merchandise imported," provided, among other things, that the duties on tea when imported direct in American ships should be but 58 per cent. of those collected when imported through Europe or in foreign

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ships, thus early creating a demand for our famous China clippers, and laying the foundation for that triangular trade which was not successfully attacked until shortly before our civil war; a trade which David Ricardo, the renowned inventor of the theory of rent, spoke of as the most profitable part of commerce.

Bounties were also given on fish exported; a discount of ten per cent. of the duty was given on the imports in vessels built in the United States and owned by a citizen or citizens thereof, and the tonnage dues were fixed at six cents for vessels sailing under our flag, 30 cents on American built vessels under foreign flags, and 50 cents per ton on foreign built vessels. The effect of these enactments on our registered tonnage, those vessels engaged in foreign commerce or whaling, was almost magical. The tonnage increased from 123,893 to 603,376 tons, or 384 per cent., in one decade, while our wonderful growth in wealth and manufactures excited the attention of Europe; the Earl of Carlisle asserting that these causes "led to the introduction and extended the growth of American manufactures."

But we were opposed by a nation possessing greater capital and cheaper materials for ship building (except wood) than ourselves, which for 150 years had lived under a navigation act intended to "increase the shipping and to encourage the navigation of this country, whereon, under the good providence and protection of God, the wealth, the safety, and the strength of this empire are so much dependent," as the preamble to Charles II., 12th, recites. Since 1850 it has been thought advisable for the interests of British commerce to hold that the Navigation Act of England did not either increase the shipping, or encourage the navigation of that country, and all are familiar with the statement, yet Ricardo, speaking of this Act in the House of Commons, said, "Which until the year 1822 was held to be the perfection of human wisdom."

Possibly the reasons for calling in question the wisdom of this act are nowhere more clearly set forth than in a speech made in the House of Commons, May 12, 1826, by Mr. Huskisson, President of the Board of Trade, in which he entered into "An Exposition of the Present State of the Navigation of the United Kingdom," saying that navigation laws had a two-fold object: "First, to create and maintain in this country a great commercial marine, and, secondly (an object not less important in the eyes of states-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men), to *prevent any other nation from engrossing too large a portion of the navigation of the rest of the world.*" For this reason the right of importing foreign produce into England was limited, as much as possible, either to ships of the producing country or to British ships, so that the portion of the foreign carrying trade which did not fall to English shipping, should be divided among the maritime States, and not engrossed by any one. These regulations "were not formed merely for the preservation and encouragement of our own commerce, but also to weaken the powerful marine of Holland. Guided by this policy, our ancestors applied more severe measures toward the Dutch than they thought necessary toward any other nation."

Asking under what circumstances England founded her navigation system, he answers: "When her commercial marine was comparatively insignificant, her wealth inconsiderable, before manufactures were established, and when she exported corn, wool and other raw materials; when, on the other hand, Holland and the Netherlands were rich, possessed of great manufactures and of the largest portion of the carrying trade of Europe and of the world. What followed? The commercial marine of the other countries has dwindled away and that of Great Britain is now immense. But, in the progress of the change, England is become the great seat of manufactures and trading wealth. This was our state, though in a far less degree than at present, when America became independent. She started by applying towards us the system which we had applied towards Holland. She was then poor, with a very small commercial marine, without manufactures, having corn and raw materials to export; and we know what her shipping now is."

The freedom of a nation of better shipbuilders and sailors than the English, whose laws and policy were not dependent on nor inspired by British interests, and its effect, is thus described by Huskisson. "The peace with America gave the first great blow to the navigation system of this country. There had now arisen an independent state in the New World. Our colonies had fought for, and had taken, a station in the rank of nations. They had new interests in navigation to attend to, and a commerce of their own to protect. It therefore became imperative on this country, unless we were prepared to relinquish all trade with America, to conform to circumstances."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We all know how this conformation to circumstances brought on the war of 1812, which, with its results, calls out the following euphuistic sentence: "After a long struggle to counteract the navigation system of America, without in any degree relaxing our own, this country found it necessary to adopt the system of reciprocity, on which, since the year 1815, the commercial intercourse between the two countries has been placed." This reciprocity, according to Mr. Huskisson, consisted on the part of England in prohibition of the import of goods the produce of Asia, Africa or America in foreign ships unless in those of the producing country. And on our part of extending the prohibition to the various countries of Europe, so that an American ship could load at Liverpool or any other port, with any goods found there, while an English ship was restricted to English goods. He then asks if a mutual relaxation of these prohibitive clauses would not be advantageous to British shipping interests.

One instance which should not have escaped the attention of writers on this subject is, that until the law of August 5, 1882, our legal net registered tonnage was the gross tonnage of a vessel, while the net tonnage of a British steam vessel might be less than half the gross tonnage, so that an American built vessel under our flag would pay more port and dock dues in New York harbor, and in the harbors of the world, than under the English or nearly any other foreign flag. For example, the National Line Steamer America, which has a gross tonnage of 5,528 tons, and only 2,829 tons net, if built in this country, and under the American flag, would have paid for port dues in this harbor on the 5,528 tons, or $1,658.40, but if transferred to the English flag, it would have paid on only 2,829 tons, or $847.70.

The existence of a law so oppressive to our shipping interests on our statute books in 1882, shows a wide divergence from the spirit of the laws of 1789, which has apparently escaped the researches of the two writers whose views have been quoted.

Mr. Gladstone did not hesitate to express his conviction that through the possession of capital "we shall be able to meet any other country and to beat it." Though he said, and the sentence reads queerly in the light of his more recent utterances on the subject, "In 1842 America passed a highly restrictive tariff, and, in 1846, she relaxed it again; but I am afraid there are serious apprehensions to be entertained that the same influences that carried

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Presidential election may lead to alteration of the tariff *favorable to their interests.*"

About 1840, Cunard, by a series of masterly private negotiations with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had secured a subsidy of £60,000 per annum for a monthly line between Liverpool and Halifax and Boston, and then had it increased by 1849 to £90,000 for the same monthly service.

In the meantime, the Great Western Steamship Company of England had shown that in spite of the greater speed attained by our Liverpool packets going east, steam communication was, on the round trip, faster and always more reliable. And as freight was £7 per ton, passage 39 guineas ($198.68), with an extra postage on letters of one shilling sterling, our Government subsidized the Collins line. Cunard hastened to England, and without public letting secured a contract for a line to New York with an annual subsidy of £145,000. This put the Great Western line out of the race and they objected. Cunard testified before the Committee on Contract Packet Service, 1849: "I saw that the American Government was giving encouragement to a mail line which would interfere very much with me, and equally with the Government; depriving the Government of half its postage and me of half my passengers. *If I had got this contract three months sooner, there would have been no American line.*"

Mr. Golburn, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, defended, before Parliament, his disregard of the rights of the Great Western Company by the question, "Was it not obvious that the employment of two companies for accomplishing the same object would be more expensive to the public, and probably less effective, even supposing them both able to face the difficulties of the undertaking?" Subsequently, in the House of Lords, "He admitted that it was not done except at a very heavy expense, but it was not right to place that expense to the account of the post-office." (See Hansard's LXIV, 321.)

In the face of this determination of the British Government to capture the North Atlantic carrying trade, without regard to expense or the vested capital of its subjects, Senators Davis and Toombs, in anticipation of a rebellion, with the help of the dough-face vote, succeeded in passing a law approved by President Buchanan on June 14th, 1858, enacting that it should not be lawful for a Postmaster-General to make any contract with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any American or other vessel for carrying the mails for a greater compensation than sea and inland postage, nor for a longer time than two years; while the Cunard line, which had had its subsidy increased to £191,400 per annum, was working under a nine years' contract.

This law accomplished what was intended, the immediate destruction of the Collins line. The Havre and Bremen lines followed in the course of one or two years, and "a firm step," but not a first one, towards the success of the approaching Rebellion was taken. And now our advocates of British commercial supremacy divide their time between expressions of sorrow over the fact that we have no trans-Atlantic steamer line, and trying to convince the people that sending all our exports of manufactured goods, via Liverpool, forcing them to pay freight to that port and factors' charges there, before starting in competition with the manufactures of Great Britain, is "the natural order of things."

As British commercial and manufacturing interests have been able to procure the publication and wide dissemination of statements which have induced a general belief in this country that her heavy expenditures for mail packets have not been "for the special object of encouraging ship using and shipbuilding," but solely upon considerations affecting the efficiency and economy of the mail service, "or when any other considerations had weight, it was the necessity for intercourse with the colonies. I will quote from the Report of the Committee on Contract Packets, presented to both Houses of Parliament, by command of her Majesty, 1853:"

"The object which appears to have led to the formation of these contracts and to the larger expenditure involved, were to afford us rapid, frequent, and punctual communication with those distant ports *which feed the main arteries of British commerce,* and with the most important of our foreign possessions; *to foster maritime enterprise, and to encourage the production of a superior class of vessels,* which would promote the convenience and wealth of the country in time of peace, and assist in defending its shores against hostile aggression."

"These expectations have not been disappointed." . . . "It is not easy to estimate the pecuniary value of these results. . ."

"Lastly, it is to be considered that there are several services which, if they were not carried on by the British Government,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would probably be undertaken by the governments of foreign states. . . ."

Referring to the Cunard subsidy, which was shown to have grown to £173,340, or to be at the rate of $2.72½ per mile, it is asserted the subsidy was £61,642 in excess of the postage received.

"They attach great importance to a long and undisturbed term of contract as above, enabling them to incur the expenses necessary for a successful competition with their rivals." This contract, which was to continue at that time until 1862, was extended for five years in 1859, after the Collins line had been crushed, as above shown, by a combination of expectant rebels and doughfaces.

The value of a long time contract was shown as late as last July, when an extension of the Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company's contract was under consideration before Parliament. According to "Herapaths' Railway and Commercial Journal," "Mr. Sutherland, the chairman of the company, in a very lucid statement showed that *the company do not favor foreign producers*, or use their power to injure the English shipping companies."

The assertion that the Collins line was destroyed by the law of 1858 is confirmed by some remarkable questions asked a Treasury official by members of a Parliamentary Committee on Packet and Telegraph Contracts in 1859. Some of these are transcribed:

By Richard Cobden:

"Q. 558. You are aware that it (the Collins line) ceased because the American Government withdrew the subsidy?"

By Mr. Wilson:

"Q. 613. Mr. Cunard's contract is £191,000, is it not?"

"A. Yes, £191,400."

"Q. 617. £320,000 is the amount which is now paid by this country and the colony for the trans-Atlantic postage, including the Galway line?"

"Q. 618. And in the face of these increasing subsidies the American Government has altogether relinquished the practice of subsidizing their vessels, and their vessels, of course, have been driven off the passage?"

It is doubtful if contempt for the patriotism or sense of any body of men was ever more thoroughly expressed than in questions 558 and 618, by which Messrs. Cobden and Wilson preserved in the pages of an official English document the story of our loss of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the North Atlantic carrying trade. Yet it is probable that the persons who delivered philippics in Congress against American interests, and wrote articles asserting that the withdrawal of subsidies was the only thing necessary for the financial success of the line, and the triumphant extension of American commerce, at least received the high honor of praise from England for their broad views, original thought, and thorough knowledge of political economy, as is the case with their successors of like kidney at the present day.

Three hundred and twenty thousand pounds, sterling, supported as it was by a patriotic national feeling, prevailed against an appropriation of $346,500, impelled by treason to every American interest. Under these circumstances English writers commenced preaching against subsidies. But the Cunard line is now getting a subsidy of $85,000 a year, a proceeding on a parity with a yearly land grant to the Illinois Central Railroad.

Hand in hand with the misinformation regarding the duration and action of our navigation laws and the purposes of the "Mail Packet Contracts," statements intended to injure or, at least, efficient in injuring our commercial and manufacturing interests, have been freely promulgated, as in "Our Merchant Marine." "And that was not in any sense as subsidy, but under contracts made by the Post-Office Department, solely upon considerations affecting the efficiency and economy of the mail service.

"But in every case these payments, by whatever names they have been designated, have been no more than was indispensable to secure the necessary mail, or the Government service, and no act of British legislation can be cited to show that money was ever voted by Parliament for the purpose of aiding in the construction and employment of ships for the British commercial marine.

And, "all these assertions, however, will be found on examination to rest upon no truthful or substantial basis, and are what may be properly designated as 'historic lies.'"

In the London *Times* of September 28th, 1886, is a letter from J. Henniker Heaton, M.P., to Postmaster-General Raikes, in which, after quoting the assertion of the Secretary of the Treasury, that "we are losing £1,000 a day, £365,000 a year, by our ocean mail service," he says: "As a matter of fact the amount ought to be reduced by the amount of the enormous sub-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sidies paid for purposes utterly different from those for which the post-office exists. It cannot be insisted upon too strongly that the subsidies are not paid by way of making up a deficiency in the postal accounts, *but in order to keep up the character of our merchant fleet.*

"As bearing on this question of subsidies, I may mention that three years ago England was the only European country sending regular and fast steamships to Australia. Three years ago the French Government subsidized the powerful Messagaries Maritimes to the amount of £160,000 a year. The company thereupon built for the Australian trade six magnificent steamers. . . . Each of these steamers now takes to France £100,000 worth of Australian produce every trip, and carries some of our mail. I observe that the four weekly steamers are now to be changed to fortnightly, with a subsidy of £250,000 a year.

"The German Government is equally alert. It has established a splendid line of steamers to Australia, with a subsidy of £120,000 a year.

"The danger with which these subsidized lines threaten our colonial trade need not be concealed . . . . , but are we to assume that subsidized trade reaching the enormous volume of £100,000 will not be reciprocated ?"

There seems to be a direct antithesis between the two views quoted. Of course the well-known Quaker gun that our tariff prevents exportation of manufactured goods will here be brought to the front for the benefit of those who, getting their intelligence by second hands, do not know that in 1885 $27\frac{2}{10}$ per cent. of our exported manufactured produce went to Great Britain and Ireland, and that between 1860 and 1886 the value of our exports of manufactured products had increased 133 per cent., while the value of agricultural products increased only 75 per cent. during that time.

But Mr. Heaton does not rest with his letter to the London *Times*. In a communication to *The Colonies and India*, July 8th, 1887, he states, as if he had "historic lies" in his mind:

"The deficit of £365,000 is due to the subsidies which are given to various lines of steamships which carry the mails and by the amount of these subsidies the deficit ought to be reduced. . . . . In fact, there exists at this moment a law under which any steamer sailing from an English port can be com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pelled to carry mails to the port of destination, no matter where, for 1d. per letter. *Letters are now carried to Australia and New Zealand at a charge to the Government of only 1d. per letter, in fast steamers not subsidized; yet in order to bolster up the subsidized steamers, the Government of England charges the people 6d. per letter.*"

The italics are Mr. Heaton's, and the subsidy paid to the Australian steamers is £170,000 per annum.

In the annual report on the foreign commerce of the United States for 1884, in a letter addressed to the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics by Mr. Atkinson, the question is asked: "Why has not a system of steamship communication been established, without any bounty or subsidy, between the United States and South America, as has been done between Great Britain and South America?" On writing to Mr. Nimmo complaining of the perversion of fact implied by the above question, I was assured that Mr. Atkinson, who was well acquainted with the history of this subject, thought my complaint was dealing with "ancient history."

In a report issued by the British post-office in 1863, it is said: "To assume that those packets were only established for post-office purposes is to charge the government with the most absurd extravagance. The West India packets, for instance, were established at a cost of £240,000 per annum, though the utmost return that was expected from letters was £40,000, leaving the £200,000 a clear deficit."

The contract with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, made for 10 years commencing in 1841, was by private agreement at the rate of £240,000 per annum, when the West Indian and Mexican Packet Company, according to testimony before a Parliamentary Committee, was doing the work for £76,373. In July, 1850, a new contract was made with the Royal Mail Company, to extend over 11 years, with 12 months' notice of discontinuance, at the rate of £270,000 per annum, for not to exceed 547,296 miles of sea service, between the latitude of the mouth of Jupiter Inlet in Florida and the mouth of La Plata, and as far west as the Isthmus of Panama. Any additional service to be paid for at the rate of 9 shillings and 10 pence, $2.36, per mile.

In 1863 another contract, to commence in 1864, was made with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, to continue six

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years, with twelve months' notice, at the following annual rates, viz.:

To Rio	£33,500
To the West Indies	172,914
	£206,414

On January 30th, 1883, Postmaster-General Fawcett said, in reply to a Parliamentary question: "The amount paid to the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company as an annual subsidy under contract was £80,500, and the amount of net receipts from the postage was £28,000." And on March 24th, 1884, Mr. Evelyn Ashley, in reply to another Parliamentary question, said of a new contract with his company, in the face of tenders for a less amount, "that several other tenders were sent in, but they proposed to take the mails via New York, *which was not a convenient course.*"

Our mails and ambassadors for years went to Rio via Liverpool. John Roach, who established a direct line between this port and Rio, reducing the freight on coffee, according to official statistics, from 75 cents and $1 per bag to an average of 40 cents, was, for this and other crimes against the trade and commerce of Great Britain, driven into bankruptcy and an unnecessarily early grave, with no recognition of his honesty except the abject apology of the *Evening Post*, the zeal of whose editor had led it into actionable calumny. Postmaster-General Vilas, with an appropriation in hand, nullifies the laws he had sworn to execute, and offers for this and other foreign mail service the pay with which Toombs and his co-conspirators arranged for the transfer of our commerce to Great Britain. Her Gracious Majesty has conferred the honor of knighthood on many a man who has done far less for British interests.

In "The Question of Ships," by J. H. Jerrold Kelley, Lieutenant United States Navy (Appleton, 1884), a book which has weight given it by being based on a prize essay on the subject, "Our Merchant Marine; the Sources of its Decline and the Means to be Taken for its Revival," the following sentence occurs: "Of the £783,000 voted in 1881, more than one-half went for mail purposes, and not a guinea was tabooed to ships surveying mankind with a commercial view, or built in any country from China to Peru."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Whether this sentence means anything more than that other subjects besides history are neglected at our national school for dilettanti sailors, the reader may judge. But as the English postal authorities refuse to send regular mails by the Fulda, which rescued the passengers of the Oregon without salvage, an act which, according to English papers, forged another link which binds England and Germany together, Lieutenant Kelley evidently cannot mean that England is building up the German merchant marine, as we are building up the English, even though the Fulda was built in England, and the charge per pound for letters via Southampton would be only one shilling ten pence, instead of three shillings via Cork.

Whatever mistiness there may be in the sentence quoted, Lieut. Kelley is an ardent advocate for the repeal of the navigation law. No stronger arguments for free ships were found in our newspapers just before the failure of the Glasgow Bank, with mortgages on some sixty unsalable steamers, than can be found in his book.

In none of the arguments, pro and con, on the question of free ships, has any one ever intimated that any part of the maritime position we held up to 1855 was due to the purchase of foreign ships, or to the procurement of foreign models. In the days before Polk, when the efforts of the Americans had been successfully directed to increasing and extending our commercial influence, and establishing a powerful maritime force, the only foreign-built vessels admitted to American register were those taken in war, mostly British, and then, as now, the British were neither as good modelers, sailmakers, or sailors as the Americans. This is a fact that even the dough-faces, who in 1858 voted with Toombs to destroy our commerce and cripple our export trade, were proud of, until Cunard had for some time received his enormous subsidies. And though it now suits the purpose of many to assert the contrary, the wonderful record of our yachts in the contests for the "America cup" fully controverts their statements.

Including the first race at Cowes in 1851, when the report was, "May it please your Majesty, there *is* no second," to the contest of last summer, there have been eight trials for its possession, in which seventeen races have been sailed, in only one of which, when the "Columbia" broke its steering gear, did the English yachts fail to "keep astern," and Lieutenant Henn, who spent a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year on our coast, says in the London *Field*: "Their ordinary coasting schooners would give many of our cruising schooner yachts all they could do to beat them, and most of the Gloucester fishing schooners, to say nothing of the pilot boats, can leave most of our cruising yachts out of sight."

This testimony, with the records of our races, is conclusive that we still retain our skill as marine architects and sailors; and it would take careful search among our professors of political economy to find a man who would assert that these races have not improved the models of English yachts. An acquaintance with the merits of our river, sound, and coasting steamers would convince any one that, if our opportunities for building ocean-going steamships had not been curtailed by the law of 1858, the world's sea borne freights and passengers would now be carried quicker and cheaper than at present, and the increase of ocean freights would have proceeded at a faster rate than the increase of our railroad freights, since we reduced our freight charges to between one-half and one-third of those in England, with a saving in freight money of £200,000,000, or $1,000,000,000 for the year 1884, on what we would have paid if our freight charges were as high as they are in England.

It seems absurd to argue that we, who stand pre-eminent for the efficiency and cheapness of our locomotives, cars, and railroad service generally, who have introduced our types of stationary engines and pumps into England, where they are either purchased or built, retain our old skill as sailors and have the fastest and best river and coastwise steamers in the world, cannot build and sail the fastest and best ocean steamers at the lowest cost, if our Government extended the same aid to our shipping which the merchant marine of England has received, and which Germany, France, Spain, Italy, and Austria are now giving to their shipping.

But no, papers which have had nothing to say about the Cunard or Vancouver-Hong Kong subsidy, that long stood the inconvenience resulting from all our mails from England arriving in one day, without criticism, and have failed to inform their readers that France and Italy, buying their ships from England, finding that a payment for mileage sailed was inefficient, resorted to direct subsidies, have found profit and pleasure in filling their columns with arguments for the prosperity of Clyde shipbuilders, and denunciations of subsidies—if paid to Americans.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When Gordon was cooped up in Kartoum, it was proposed to build a railroad from Suakim to Berber, and American pumps were ordered to supply water in the desert. British papers exclaimed, "we should like to know why the contract was let to an American at all, and why a single penny of the money paid by the British tax-payer should be sent out of this country?" "Warfare will assume a totally different aspect if British taxes are to be employed to enrich the rival manufacturers of other countries, while our own artisans lack bread."

The railroad could not be built without water.

There were no English pumps which could supply water for the distance required.

The Suakim-Berber road is not built.

And we are advised to buy ships for peace and war, where their purchase will enrich the rival manufacturers of a nation which, turning its attention from the Dutch to us, has not at any time ceased trying to reduce us to the condition of the Hollanders; even rewarding Laird with knighthood, whose efforts to prevent our engrossing too large a share of the world's commerce cost her $15,000,000 "smart money."

Mr. Wells and others advise us to buy our ships from England, and develop a superior class of naval constructors by repairing them. Something like this plan has been tried in literature, but has not proved entirely successful.

We are now just completing a century of national existence; and though, under the circumstances, nothing can be done with the small remnant, we can easily, if we will, arrange for a government which shall not only refrain from giving away every American interest in an effort to reduce us to the level of less favored nations, but will restore us to the proud position on the sea we were holding forty years ago.

E. P. North.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

HOW TO NAME CHILDREN.

THERE are some things which we cannot reason out. Science fails to disclose the reason why the cyclone, in its semi-elliptical whirl moves from the right to the left in the Northern hemisphere, and from the left to the right in the Southern half of the globe; and so too some unknown force directs the spiral course of the creeping vine. May there not be some subtle forces directing the fate of men? Do natural laws govern only the movement of the winds or the growth of plants? May not a name bestowed upon the helpless infant produce effects, and become "One of the few, the immortal names that were not born to die?"

Our first parents and the prominent persons spoken of in Holy Writ seem to have had but one name: Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, Moses, Aaron, and Joshua. But, passing without notice the intervening ages and coming down to our own times and confining ourselves particularly to our own country, if we examine the names of our great men we will be surprised at the preponderance of single-named (meaning but one name in addition to the surname) persons.

Let us go to the Revolution. Take the signers of the Declaration of Independence. First we find a committee appointed to draft it. They were Jefferson, Adams, Franklin, Sherman, and Livingston. None of these had middle names except Livingston. Of those who signed the Declaration, on the part of the States, there were as follows:

5 from Massachusetts, of whom one had a middle name.
3 from New Hampshire, of whom none had middle names.
2 from Rhode Island, do. do.
4 from Connecticut, do. do.
4 from New York, do. do.
5 from New Jersey, do. do.
9 from Pennsylvania, do. do.
3 from Delaware, do. do.
3 from Maryland, do. do.
3 from North Carolina, do. do.
4 from South Carolina, do. do.
3 from Georgia, do. do.
6 from Virginia, of whom two had middle names.

So that out of the fifty-three signers there were only three who had more than one name.

In 1786 there was a commercial convention called to meet at Annapolis to consider the commercial relations of New York, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Virginia. Not a solitary delegate to that convention had a middle name.

In 1787 a convention was held to revise the Constitution, and out of the fifty-six delegates to this convention there were only five with more than one name.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of the forty-eight who signed the Articles of Confederation on the 9th of July, 1788, only four had more than one name. Of the thirty-six speakers of the House during the first half century of the nation's existence, only twelve had more than one name. Of the five Chief Justices during the same period none had more than one name. (Now that there is a vacancy let double-named aspirants beware.) Of the thirty-one Associate Justices during the same period only five had more than one name. Of the eighteen Secretaries of State only two had middle names; of the eighteen Secretaries of the Treasury, only eight; of the twenty-six Secretaries of War, only nine; of the twenty-one Secretaries of the Navy, only eight.

We have had twenty-two presidents during our national existence. Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Van Buren, Tyler, Fillmore, Pierce, Buchanan, Lincoln, Johnson, and Cleveland all entered into office without the unnecessary luggage of a middle name. These sum up fifteen out of the twenty-two, and all the "two-termers" are in the list except one (U. S. Grant). Under such circumstances, now that we approach a Presidential election is it not pertinent to inquire, "What 's in a name?"

As far as I have been able to ascertain, only five ex-Senators became President: John Quincy Adams, Martin Van Buren, James Monroe, Andrew Jackson, James Buchanan—all of one name, except the ubiquitous Adams, who seems to have held every office of note in the country except the Chief Justiceship. As Grover Cleveland will be the Democratic nominee, it is well for the Republicans to remember that it seems to be an unwritten law that no Senator (particularly if he has a middle name) can be elected; and so, if they will take a Senator to test the rule, they have few to choose from. There is John Sherman, or Philetus Sawyer, or E. Hale, or J. Chace, or perhaps one or two more.

Is there not something in a name? Must not there be some influence, which we know not of, which, under the operation of cause and effect, produces such results as are cited above. It is true that there are instances of great men whose names are long and whose achievements are famous, but are they not few compared with the number of great men with single names?

PETER J. OTEY.

II.

OUR HOLD ON CUBA.

DO WE want Cuba? Do we want her as an integral part of the Nation? Do we want her as a colonial possession? I think the unanimous voice of the country would answer "No!" to both interrogatories. But is there not another species of ownership which will confer upon us all the advantages which would accrue from annexation without hampering us with the responsibilities springing out of annexation? It seems to me that Mother Britain has taught us how to own Cuba without owning it—how to control Cuba without governing it—how to reap all benefits of Cuban possession without the expense and responsibilities of Cuban protection.

Over the savage and semi-civilized tribes and nations which the commercial and religious zeal of the subjects of Victoria have subjugated to British influence, Great Britain, as a nation, has established what she calls "Commercial Supremacy." In plain language, she permits these weaker races to buy their rum, their Brummagem idols, and their scanty needs of dry-goods, only from herself, and prohibits them—not by force, but by the "laws of trade"—from disposing of their native products in markets other than those controlled by Englishmen.

To be sure, we have no American opium that we need market at the points of bayonets or the muzzles of guns, upon unwilling and inoffensive Cubans; but, inasmuch as we improved upon the British Constitution, so likewise we may improve

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the methods of the British tradesman. In the easiest and simplest manner possible, we can place Cuba at our mercy, by simply shutting her sugar out of American markets. And we can do this without over-taxing the energies of our navy, or incurring the displeasure of European powers. We have simply to increase the duties on imported sugar, and at once have Cuba at our mercy, and at the same time strengthen one of the great agricultural interests of our own country.

V. PERRY ATWELL.

III.

THE DEATH INSTINCT IN ANIMALS.

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW has given considerable space of late to discussing the instincts and reasoning powers of animals. One of the most interesting questions in this line of investigation is the question whether animals are subject to premonitions of impending death. It seems sometimes as if they could feel their mortal peril without any promptings of their five senses. I remember killing a cat once in my youth, when a second shot was necessary to finish it. As I leveled my gun at the wounded creature, she turned on me a look which I can still vividly recall, after the lapse of years. There was a dignity and a despair in her look that astonished me. She was an abject and wretched creature, to which death was a merciful kindness; but the terrible look of Death that she gave me haunted me for some time.

A gentleman of my acquaintance had a beautiful tortoise-shell cat of which he and his wife were very fond. For some reason or other they most reluctantly decided to kill it, and the gentleman went out to the barn and hunted up an axe and block suitable for the disagreeable operation. When he returned to the sitting-room, the big, lazy cat was lying on his wife's lap, purring contentedly. He started to pick it up, with perfect gentleness, as he had often done, but the cat suddenly shrank back from his grasp and, looking straight up into his face, gave a most unearthly howl, as of utter despair. Both the look and the cry were quite unlike anything that he or his wife had ever seen or heard. It seemed as if the creature were conscious of his intention. What mysterious sense told it of the axe and block awaiting it?

A case still more interesting, for which I can vouch, was that of a cow and her calf. The farmer who owned them kept the calf in his barn, but drove the cow off to a distant pasture every morning with the rest of the herd. She soon became reconciled to the arrangement, and was accustomed to feed quietly until it was time to return to her calf. One day the farmer killed the calf suddenly and painlessly. There was no outcry, no chance for the cow to see the deed. She was at a distance from the barn, which apparently precluded the possibility of her knowing what had been done. Yet no sooner was the calf dead, than she left her grazing with the rest of the herd and came up to the bars, lowing and showing every symptom of uneasiness. There she stayed from noon till milking time, moving about restlessly, as she had never done before. In this case the death instinct seems to have been interwoven with the subtle maternal instinct. There was no communication possible, so far as human senses could perceive, between mother and offspring; yet there is no doubt that the cow had at least some dim knowledge of what was going on, and that she suffered more than the calf did.

Probably other cases of this kind could be gathered together, if diligent inquiry were made. Such a collection would be of great value to the physiologist and psychologist.

ARTHUR MARK CUMMINGS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IV.

MR. CARNEGIE ON SURPLUS REDUCTION.

MR. ANDREW CARNEGIE is not only an agreeable writer, but—so true is the rule that the optimist is likely to be right and the pessimist to be wrong in forecasting the future—a usually trustworthy writer. To two or three errors, however, in his essay on "The Surplus" in your March number, the general excellence of that essay renders it desirable to call attention.

It is safe to class his assumption that an average reduction of ten per cent. on import duties would be "certain to increase revenues," though such assumptions are often made, as an error. There is no certainty at all; only doubtful hypothesis. He supposes that imports would increase by more than ten per cent., without showing how we are going to find the ten corresponding per cent. additional goods to export, or how, failing this, we are going to escape the conditions which necessitate a substantial equivalence of imports and exports in international commerce. It is easy, doubtless, to point to instances where relieving a few articles of duty has been followed by largely increased importation of those articles; but this result of special reductions, too limited to affect the general balance of trade, could not be proportionately magnified by extending reduction to imported articles generally. Moreover, if this reduction were not the "horizontal" one contemplated by him, but affected raw materials chiefly, Mr. Carnegie's supposed effect would probably be reversed. Putting wool and ores on the free list could hardly fail, by cheapening supplies, to stimulate home manufactures of those articles, and diminish importations, thus giving a twofold reduction of revenue.

Mr. Carnegie follows Senator Sherman's example in slurring over the distinction, for this purpose so important, between "raw" and "finished" products; going even so far as to insinuate a doubt that the distinction is a valid one. But, without worrying over definitions, we must admit one clear difference between the production of an article ready for the consumer's use, and that of an article requiring additional labor to complete it. By protecting the latter we increase the cost of further elaboration and so impose a burden upon industry; while protection of the former has little direct effect on other industries, except in furnishing a home market for unfinished products. If, for instance, Spanish ore is easier to obtain for our manufacturers than ore from Lake Superior, as Mr. Carnegie states, and if an import duty has to be levied for the purpose of making it less accessible to them, the increased cost of material must put them at a disadvantage as compared with foreigners under no such burden, unless care is taken to shift this burden from shoulder to shoulder till the consumer is reached, that he may bear the whole of it. Also, unless we wish the blessings of protection to be monopolized by the producer of the crudest ware, we must increase the burden a little with each shifting, and so multiply it considerably for the consumer. But it must here be acknowledged that Mr. Carnegie may be quite correct in his practically most important contention. He can say with confidence that "Congress will not admit iron ore free of duty," and similarly with "the question of free coal," because he knows how weak and fallible our Congress is. Expectations from that body would be very different, were the Congress composed of statesmen instead of congressmen.

Our old acquaintance, the claim that "protection is given to home industries on account of the greater cost of labor here," greets us once more from Mr. Carnegie's lines. As usually met, it travels arm-in arm with that other claim, that the reward of the laborer is kept up in this country by tariff duties, and would sink to starvation-point on their removal; whereby two phenomena are neatly presented as at the same time cause and effect of each other. The simple

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

truth appears to be, that the greater cost of labor here is partly fictitious—an expression, that is, of the fact that money is of smaller value in our land, because our laws give it less purchasing power outside—partly a result of the greater intrinsic value of a day's labor by the educated American operative than by his worse-endowed foreign rival, and partly due to the better opportunities afforded the skilled workman in a newer country for setting up in business on his own account; altogether independent, so far as real, of import taxes, and capable of surviving their total abolition.

The insinuation with which he closes, that the President and others who advocate tariff reduction are sailing under false colors, calls for mention—hardly for serious refutation. Mr. Carnegie has made out quite a strong case in favor of using up the surplus to pay our still huge debt with; but he is not to be trusted when he intimates that such as wish to collect smaller revenues must be either stupid or dishonest.

WASHINGTON, D. C. HENRY FARQUHAR.

V.

AN IMPORTANT ANNIVERSARY.

DATING backwards from the 23d day of last April, and into the early years of the nation, if we run over exactly half a century of time, we come to an event which should fill the hearts of all good Americans with joint sensations of pride and sorrow. On the 23d of April, 1838, the British steamer "Sirius" steamed into New York harbor, followed, a few hours later, by another British steamer, the "Great Western." Looking at the event with the calmness that comes to us as a succeeding generation, we know that our forefathers unwittingly saw in this twin arrival a presage of our future (now present) commercial relations with Great Britain; for the arrival of these vessels at the port of New York was, in fact, the real beginning of steam navigation between this country and Europe—they were, in fact, the pioneer vessels of practical steam commerce. That we should feel pride in their arrival is justly due to those Americans who taught the builders and navigators of the "Sirius" and "Great Western" the possibilities of that American invention, the steam-ship; for it was an American vessel (the "Savannah"), designed, built, owned and navigated by citizens of the United States which, nineteen years previously, had told to the wondering nations of the world the possibilities of the marine steam-engine. That we should feel sorrow, mingled with the kin sensations of shame and regret, is but natural, when we consider how, during the last half century, Great Britain has usurped the steam carrying trade which properly belonged and belongs to the United States.

It would seem to be one of the laws of fate that an inventor should never reap the full benefit of his invention. It would seem as if the United States, the home of the inventor of the ocean steamship, had suffered from the operation of this same law. But man should be superior to fate; and truly the American has shown heretofore, in many ways, an ability to conquer fate; and even now the country is restless over the commercial supremacy of Great Britain; and men in all walks of life are beginning to discuss the measures that should be taken to procure for the United States the commercial marine to which her God-given ocean boundaries and the ability of her citizens justly entitle her.

Never, then, was there a more opportune moment for the discussion of those means and measures by which the United States is once again to lead the world in international navigation.

ETIENNE AYRAULT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VI.

"FLEXIBLE MAJORITIES."

In his very able and catholic paper entitled "A Perilous Balance," in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for April, Mr. Rossiter Johnson says much that appeals to the good sense of every well-disposed American, whether of native or foreign birth. Certain of his conclusions, however, are hardly borne out when considered in the light of reasonable non-partisanship. It may probably be assumed that he means "Mugwumps" when he alludes to "Such cranks as choose to band themselves into little makeweight parties that constitute balances of power," and he kindly proceeds, in the next sentence, to remove the somewhat opprobrious taint that might attach to the term by calling for "majorities so flexible that they can be cast one way at one election and the opposite way at the next."

That is precisely the end for which Independents or Mugwumps exist, but Mr. Johnson seems to lose sight of the fact that before he can establish his flexible majorities of "twenty to one" on a working basis, there must needs be a modest beginning liable to denunciation as "little makeweight parties," and the like, to which he refers with such undisguised contempt. Every Republican probably regards the birth of his party as the inception of a genuine reform movement, but it is within the recollection of men not so very old that when the "free soil" defection took place from the Whig ranks, nay, later, when the Republican party itself came into existence, its members were the Mugwumps of their day, and were freely accused of "pharisaism," of setting themselves upon a "holier than thou" platform, and so on; phrases which every newspaper reader will recognize as familiar jibes cast at the "Independents" during the last presidential canvass. They are, in fact, phrases which rise naturally to the lips of every culprit when he finds himself in the presence of a jury that does not agree with defendant's counsel.

Mr. Johnson seems much disturbed at the nearly equal division of political parties, and the danger is, no doubt, grave in certain aspects. But there are compensations. We are all agreed that there should be larger majorities in every election, but irreconcilable differences arise when we attempt to decide from which party the majority should be drawn. In ordinary years of peace and prosperity the vote of every individual is largely influenced by personal considerations, mainly dependent, perhaps, upon the voter's pocket. The reasonable *pros* and *cons* regarding protection and free trade, for instance, are so nearly balanced that no considerable majority can be counted upon for either side, and so with regard to almost all the questions that arise in the ordinary course of events. But the moment a great vital matter distinctly involving right and wrong comes to the fore the "perilous balance" disappears, and the majority on the side of right becomes irresistible wherever there is a free vote of all the people. Such a crisis has not arisen since the great overturning of 1860–61. Leaving the slave States out of the question, since a free vote of all the people was impossible there, a glance at the returns will show that the majorities for the Government were overwhelming in all the Northern States, and the "perilous balance" was restored only when returning peace suffered the conditions once more to become normal. There might easily be honest differences of judgment concerning the proper course to be pursued regarding the treatment of the lately seceded States, and, in fact, these differences so promptly asserted themselves that the two great parties redivided practically upon traditional lines. If, however, any party should come before the people with some measure so obviously unwise that it could not be disguised by lying, the November elections would not leave public sentiment in doubt. Unquestionably

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one great trouble is the facility with which lies are multiplied. Mr. Johnson permits us to infer that he never heard of Democrats or Republicans rebuking their respective journals for lying in the interest of their own parties, or of a "Mugwump rebuking a Mugwump paper for lying on all sides." I can only account for his failure to meet such advocates of truth on the ground that, in his opinion, as soon as a Republican begins to rebuke lying in the interest of his own party he is no longer a Republican. As for Mugwumps, the chief reason why they are reviled of both parties is that they never fail to denounce lying whenever they find it. When they do so fail they are no longer worthy the name.

CHARLES LEDYARD NORTON.

VII.

PERSONAL IMMORTALITY.

THERE is nothing so pleasing to human expectation as personal immortality. To be assured of everlasting life without pain or care, without weariness or satiety, with friendships unalloyed and with knowledge ever increasing, makes all trouble and sorrow in this world seem as nothing—as the mere dust that floats with the passing breeze. But is this pleasing dream an inspiration? Do desire and expectation constitute an infallible premise upon which to found unquestionable opinions? And is there adequate compensation for the loss of these cherished ideals?

Man's body, like those of other animals, is composed of the elements of matter in chemical combination, and finally after its brief life, returns to form part of the original stock from which it was constructed. Does there dwell in this corruptible body an undying and incorruptible personality? Does the Creator do aught contrary to the universal and recognized laws of life and death? And is it not generally conceded that anything and everything that will live "to eternity" has existed "from eternity?"

The glorious sun must, in the nature of things, go out in darkness. The stars that "glitter on the mantle of night" must finally disappear. There may be a new birth of suns and stars, resultant from the same cause which placed those now shining in the heavens, and thus, by renewal, add light and lustre to the universe through a seeming eternity. So with all animate and inanimate life; it is immortal in the principle of reproduction, whose cycles roll on unceasingly unless checked by superior and antagonizing forces. Reproduction is therefore an immortal principle precluding the probability of personal immortality. With life ends man's usefulness to the world or to his Creator. Is it probable that he will be preserved for pain or pleasure, for reward or punishment? The monarchs of the forest may be reproduced for an eternity of years with unchanged and recurring seasons.

The grain of wheat from Egypt's tomb lost none of its vitality during a sleep of three thousand years. The frail, sensitive plant is equally immortal in its nature. If there is anything on earth too beautiful to die, it is the rose. Yet with all its beauty and fragrance the hoar frost regards it not, and the summer's sun, after painting its loveliness, withers it without remorse, and but for the hope inspired by this reproductive principle, we should mourn its loss and weep at its destruction. Now we can truly say and rejoice that its beauty never fades and its fragrance is everlasting.

Is man an exception to this wise and wonderful provision of nature? And is it not ample compensation to know that old age, decrepitude and uselessness are to give place to youth, strength and beauty, and that man's intelligence and virtues become an immortal inheritance by his children?

E. H. ROOD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VIII.

THE USE OF HOLIDAYS.

In the December number of the REVIEW, Mr. Geoffrey Champlin, in a Note and Comment entitled "Our National Digestion," asked why we had lost the power to digest into the bone and blood of good citizenship the hordes of foreigners who, for the last decade, had come to this country; and Mr. Benton, in the April REVIEW, has a Note and Comment entitled "The Holiday Hallucination." I think I can answer Mr. Champlin's question, and refute Mr. Benton's argument, by the statement of a few facts which these gentlemen appear to have overlooked—though both are famed in literary circles for the thoroughness of their knowledge.

There are a great many people living who have no conception of what the old-fashioned Fourth of July was like; and there is a smaller class, who, while remembering the brass bands and the military parades, the speeches and bonfires, yet fail to see that there was, in all the noise and spread-eagleism, an influence stronger than the mere pleasure of an outing or the amusement of a show. As one remembering something of those former Fourth of July celebrations, I cannot agree with Mr. Benton that our old holidays have "been more formally observed." It seems to me that no thoughtful person can, on the Fourth of July, visit any of our great cities, or indeed any portion of our land where the foreign element largely predominates, without seeing that the observance of the Nation's birthday has fallen into desuetude—has become like an European Sunday, and lost nearly, if not entirely, all of those characteristics which made it so remarkable an anniversary during the first century of the Nation's existence.

Our national holidays were not established merely as seasons of recreation and amusement, but as occasions on which the people at large were to be educated in the history of the Nation and instructed in the principles on which the Nation was founded. On Washington's Birthday it was the custom to read aloud his Farewell Address from the pulpits of churches and the rostrums of public gatherings. On the Fourth of July the Declaration of Independence was declaimed by the principal orators of the neighborhood. There was a purpose then in the celebration of these days, for he who has learned the contents of those two State papers knows at least the groundwork of our political organization. Thus the observance of our national holidays educated the people in the rights and duties and principles of citizenship, and among the people so educated were the recent immigrants from other nations. The old-time observance of national holidays was an active, vital force working for good. It was not until this old-fashioned observance of our national holidays became obsolete that the Nation began to experience difficulty in assimilating our foreign born population. It was not until Washington's Farewell Address and the Declaration of Independence had become forgotten that foreign agitators found listeners to foreign theories of government.

In the decay of the proper observance of our national holidays I see the reason why the Nation now suffers as it does, and in a return to the holiday practices of former days I see the remedy for the evils that afflict us.

GEORGE NELSON

IX.

THE DECLINE OF NEW ENGLAND.

THERE was a time when New England was looked upon as a sort of reservoir of the true American spirit; when she sent her sons and her daughters out from the towns and the farms to be teachers to the rest of the nation and to found new empires in the West; when the New England spirit seemed to be a leaven leavening all the national life.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No one, knowing what the New England characteristics were, two score years ago, can, to-day, travel through New England and fail to note the changes which time has made in the habits and characters of the people. It seems almost as if a strange race had taken possession of the soil. The traits and traditions of the earlier settlers seem to be almost wholly forgotten, and the state of life in which the former inhabitants passed their existence is obsolete. The equality which once existed between man and man—between employer and employé—has been changed; there are fewer "help" and more "servants;" the native stock has been replaced by French Canadians, Scandinavians and Irish. These changes in New England are the more important, in that they are typical of the change which is being wrought in other sections of the country where new lines of social demarkation between classes are being defined and castes are being formed.

When we look back on those good old days when to be a New Englander was to be a typical American, we can recall the pride that all men took in honest manual labor; we can recall how men and women labored without their labor lowering them in the social scale or preventing the development of their mental powers, how the squire left the scythe in the field while he leaned on the fence and talked about crops, or investments, or the last political news, to the farmer or the farmer's hired man, who was hauling grist to the nearest mill.

All this is changed. The squire has gone. The miller takes in city boarders and grinds no grain. The sturdy, independent farmer has moved westward. The French Canadian or the Swede has dispossessed the hired man, who is now a stranger, not a friend; an inferior, not an equal. Even in the factory history of New England there has been a decadence, the native born being supplanted by the foreign born, and social degradation following the change. It is from the Great West and the New South that the men now come who are typical Americans. If New England does not to-day lead the country as she did once, it is because the characteristics and modes of life of her present population no longer make great men.

A study of the reasons for the decline of New England is most interesting, nor are they hard to find. Something is due to the general change which the increase of population has worked by increasing the size of the country and creating new centres of influence. Something is due to the natural exhaustion following the drain which New England suffered when she sent the best of her brain and sinew into the fertile fields of the West, or into the battle-fields at the South, at once emptying herself of her strength and creating a vacuum into which poured rivulets from the inundation of foreign immigration (and however worthy the foreign laborer may be, something of his former state of servitude still lingers about him and humiliates him into a lower caste than the descendants of the former tillers of the soil).

But while these changes have operated to effect the decadence of New England, there is one change not hitherto mentioned, which far more than all others has caused the decline in the sturdy independence of the New England character. I mean the increased number of rich and idle people who make New England the camping ground of their summer days. When I image New England as she was, I see a modern Sparta constantly at war with a stubborn soil and a bleak climate and disciplined in strengthening labor of mind and body; when I image New England as she is to-day, I see a modern Capua, a vast hostelry, crowded with servants whose lives are spent in catering for the entertainment of idle pleasure seekers. Name for me the birthplace of any one of New England's greater sons, and in nine cases out of ten you will name one of the fashionable summer resorts. The multitude of seaport towns and country villages from which came so many of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the nation's best and greatest men are no longer now nurseries of earnest thinkers and patient workers, but the playgrounds of idle men and idler women from the cities.

It is to this idle class that New England owes the decay of her former influence. Watch any country village develop into a fashionable resort and you see the old New Englander move away. The show, the glitter, the greater wealth of the new comers, create a disparity which humiliates or offends the old settlers, and they move away; while those who stay cannot escape the pernicious influence of a large and wealthy idle class.

GEOFFREY CHAMPLIN.

X.

LEARNING TO WRITE ENGLISH.

BOOKS are made up of everything nowadays; and sometimes the most wretched stuff makes the most successful book. Lately somebody has collected a number of the most ridiculous and puerile compositions of our public-school children, and published them under the title of "Englische as she is spoke." They are of the same character as that of the boy who described a horse as "an animal with four legs, one on each end;" and a shout of laughter has gone up all over the country.

There is one thing, the simplest in the world, which is entirely neglected in our public schools, and which is perhaps the most potent means of acquiring good English that can possibly be invented. I mean the practice of constantly writing to dictation passages from the works of good authors. It is the reading-book, not the spelling-book, that should be used to learn to spell. Not only in New York, but all over the Union, the stupid practice prevails of making children memorize and write on their slates *lists of words*, instead of consecutive sentences. The book that has the largest circulation in this country is the stupidest and most meaningless book in existence, namely, Webster's Spelling-book. Now this practice of drumming single words, letter by letter, into the heads of children, affords no assistance whatever in acquiring the power of expression; it is mere parrot-like learning, unconnected with thought. Hence their inability to write thoughts. There is no surer way of making a simpleton of a boy than by drilling him for a "spelling-match," which is the laughing stock of foreigners and the favorite exercise of natives.

Consider for a moment some of the advantages of writing to dictation as compared with those derived from this word-spelling practice. 1st. By dictation, the child learns to associate words with ideas, to express *thoughts*, and not merely to spell *words*. 2d. It learns to *think* correctly by putting one thought logically after another. 3d. It learns the use of our common and most useful words, becomes familiar with the "well of English undefiled," which is much better than learning to spell *metempsychosis*, *phthisis*, etc. 4th. It acquires a *taste* for correct language by becoming practically acquainted with the idiomatic use of English words, some of which have, as is well known, directly opposite meanings according to use. 5th. It learns to spell similar sounding words according to meaning, *write*, *right*, *rite*, etc. 6th. It learns, in the very best manner, the important matter of punctuation, by putting in the points as they occur in the dictation; and when it is remembered that pointing in English composition is largely a matter of taste, it will be seen that no better method of learning it can be devised. 7th. It gives the child a *feeling* for correct language, without which no good writing is possible.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In fact, in writing to dictation the scholar drinks in good language at every pore: his hand, his eye, his ear, his mind, his imagination are all at work while so writing; he is learning the force, power, meaning and effect of words by actual use, by *doing*, which is the only correct way of learning. In spelling single words no faculty is employed except memory, the poorest of the faculties. It was by studying and writing passages from good English authors that two of our very best writers learned to compose, viz., Franklin and Cobbett, the former in Addison's *Spectator* and the latter in Swift's *Tale of a Tub*. The practice of writing to dictation is precisely the same as the work of the compositor; it is setting down word after word, thought after thought, and pointing off according to sense, and this training presents the remarkable result that half the editors of the United States, the men who form public opinion, have graduated, not from the university, but from the composing room. For heaven's sake, abolish this stupid practice of making children spell *words* and cause them to write *thoughts*, and you will have no further occasion to laugh at their use of "Englische as she is spoke."

ROBERT WATERS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

I.

COUNT TOLSTOI'S SHORT STORIES.

COUNT TOLSTOI follows the fashion so prevalent just now among men of letters, of appearing suddenly in a new and unexpected rôle. We are familiar with his name as novelist, historian, moralist and political economist. The pen of an enthusiastic translator now introduces him to us in a sort of *pot pourri* volume,* the earlier and larger portion of which is made up of children's stories. The first three are of a religious nature, and the reader anticipates a book suitable for the Sunday-school library, so pure and elevating is their tone. But these are quickly followed by marvelous accounts of bear hunts, and stories of pet dogs and horses; and by scenes from common life written after the terse fashion of the Gesta Romanorum, and in other respects similar to these ancient tales. Attractive little sketches to illustrate the elementary principles of physics, zoölogy, and botany are succeeded by a collection of fables, in part paraphrases from the Indian, and in part imitations of them. The stories selected from the Novaya Asbuka, or, as the American boy would express it, from the "New Speller, or A-B-C book," might have been taken from an appendix to the immortal, blue-covered collection of Webster. This medley of short compositions concludes with a sketch of the school for peasant children founded by Count Tolstoi at Yasnaya Polyana, one of his estates a few miles from the city of Tula, in which the Count's peculiar ideas of education are exemplified. The school was founded on the principle that all children have an intense desire to learn, and that this desire furnishes the motive for self-government; consequently, each child is allowed to go and come at pleasure. The state of things resulting from such rules, or lack of them, is acknowledged to be somewhat humiliating to the teacher, whose classes often dismiss themselves summarily, seize their hats and rush away down the street, singing and shouting as they go. Count Tolstoi believes that no disciplinary interference whatever should be allowed in the school-room. Two boys, if found fighting, will soonest come to a natural understanding if left to themselves. Both are not guilty; the innocent is liable to receive injustice at the hands of a disciplinarian, if interference is allowed; if they are forced to ask pardon of each other, the evil passions thus suddenly calmed are sure to break forth again. "All scholars are eager to learn," reasons the Count, "since they come to school for no other purpose, and if they are interested they will not let their lawlessness run into excess." The highest form of discipline is attained when the pupils are granted full liberty to learn and to behave as they please. These theories do not

* "The Long Exile, and Other Stories for Children." By Count Lyof Tolstoi. Translated from the Russian by Nathan Haskell Bole. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

readily suggest the best results to the American educator; but their practical working in the school at Yasna Polyana appears to have been, in a measure, successful.

Count Tolstoi is unquestionably a man of genius, and his merits are sufficiently appreciated in this country; but his translator's extravagant encomiums, as found in his preface, will be accepted at their face value by very few readers.

II.

CORRECTNESS IN SPEECH.

MR. J. H. LONG, in his little manual on "Slips of the Tongue and Pen,"* has collected a great deal of very useful material in the form of common errors, grammatical points, suggestions upon composition, synonyms, preferable forms of expression, objectionable words and phrases, and punctuation. Many persons will be surprised on looking the book through to find how much they do not know and how much they have to unlearn on the above points. The very first caution hits a very common misconception of the word "apparent," which is constantly used in the sense of "evident," whereas there is a very fine but real distinction between the two words. How many people fall into the way of saying a "bad cold," instead of "a severe or dangerous cold," it is impossible to say. Common use has almost established this and a great many other errors, but it is well, nevetheless, to keep up the standard of correct speech. When a person says, "I beg to say," he really means "I beg leave to say," but with the true American instinct of condensation the "leave" is often dropped. A real estate agent will probably tell you that such and such property has depreciated or appreciated in value, forgetting that "value" has no business in such a sentence. The author thinks that the intransitive meaning of "depreciate" is justifiable by usage. As to the word "differ" Mr. Long sides with those who say "differ from," but the advocates of "differ with" ought not, perhaps, to feel discouraged. To "differ *from*" a person or thing is to be different in form, or in some other particular, but when we say we differ *with* a person we really mean that we dispute his conclusions—we have a difference or a disagreement with him. We are not so sure that Mr. Long does not lose sight of this distinction. A black man *differs from* a white man in respect of his color; he "*differs with*" him when he contradicts or questions his logic. Apart, however, from an occasional instance of far-fetched criticism on common usage, this manual is evidently the work of an observant and scholarly mind, and a careful and frequent reading of it by that useful class of men and women, the reporters for newspapers, would save the English language from a great deal of very violent treatment. When a musical or dramatic critic writes about the *rendition* of a certain performance, or when one reads about a solitary traveler *partaking* of refreshments, when no one else was there to *partake with*, the commonness of the blunder is no excuse. And yet the most accurate of people will fall into such snares. Hence the utility of such unpretentious hand-books as the one now under notice.

III.

VOLAPÜK.

What is Volapük? Once in a while for a year or two past, newspaper readers have come across this mysterious word, and it is perhaps now beginning to be under-

* "Slips of Tongue and Pen." By J. H. Long, M. A., LL. B. D. Appleton & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stood that it stands for a new language,—some attempt of somebody to construct a universal language.* And with that explanation the subject has probably been dismissed from most practical minds. Mankind has settled down so thoroughly into the destiny of confusion or at least diversity of tongues that the idea of having one speech and language looks chimerical. Whether it be possible for any human being to discover a way out of the bewildering labyrinth is a question which few busy people of to-day would care to spend much time considering. To many people, perhaps most, the acquisition of any foreign language, whether living or dead, is a task so painful and forbidding as to be practically impossible. Those who reside for any length of time abroad can usually "pick up" enough of the language of the people about them to hold their own in conversation. A few gifted ones overcome all difficulties, but the majority of even educated people, including those who can read and translate in different languages, never feel at home with any but their own.

Volapük—pronounced with a long o and the German ü—signifies world language, and is the latest attempt to create some international mode of expressing thought. Its author is a German Catholic priest, J. Martin Schleyer, who devoted twenty years to the maturing of his system. It was first published to the world in 1879, but for some time did not attract much notice. It gained ground, however, steadily, and several societies were soon formed in some of the leading cities of the continent of Europe for its propagation. There are at present about a hundred and fifty of these societies, and eleven periodicals are published in its interest. The chief aim of the friends of this movement is to furnish a vehicle for international commercial correspondence in the form of a language which can be readily acquired by any intelligent person.

Mr. Sprague's Handbook supplies us with some information as to the general principles on which the construction of the language is based. Thus, the radicals or root-words are generally chosen from existing languages, the selection being made on grounds of brevity, distinctness and ease of utterance. About 40 per cent. of these root-words are from the English. The suffix ön gives the infinitive, and the other moods and tenses and the different parts of speech are formed in an equally simple manner. Every letter has a uniform and separate sound, invariably the same, and the plural is always formed by adding s to the singular. Thus, "man," singular, as in English; plural, "mans." Vom means woman; plural, voms. The inventor appears to have made a careful study of the various European languages, selecting points from every one, and avoiding all irregularities of declension and conjugation, and, as far as possible, every obscurity in accent, pronunciation and double meaning of words.

It could hardly be expected that absolute perfection has been reached, but it is no slight tribute to the author of Volapük that of the many linguists and grammarians in various countries who have given it their careful attention none have condemned it as impractical, or have suggested any very important modifications. The American Philosophical Society appointed a committee to investigate it, and though this committee pointed out some features which appeared to them open to objection, they reported on the whole strongly in its favor.

As in so many other innovations upon old ways time alone will prove the

*"Handbook of Volapük." By Charles E. Sprague, Member of the Academy of Volapük, President of the Institute of Accounts. New York: The Office Company.

"Volapük: An Easy Method of Acquiring the Universal Language," etc., etc. By Klas August Linderfelt. Milwaukee: C. N. Casper.

"Volapük: A Guide for Learning the Universal Language." By Samuel Huebsch. New York.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adaptability of Volapük to the purposes for which it is designed. No one in his serious senses can imagine that it will displace any existing language, but it may be of vast service in simplifying the methods of communication between intelligent people of different nations. It might even be wise, after its utility has been demonstrated beyond question, to make it a regular feature of popular or at any rate of commercial education in every civilized country.

Of the three handbooks before us the first-named is the largest and most comprehensive, containing a complete grammar, with chapters on derivation, prefixes and suffixes, compound words, and a copious vocabulary. It also contains a key to the exercises. The other treatises are also admirably clear, and have the great merit of conciseness.

IV.

A DIFFICULT SUBJECT DISCUSSED.

THE author of "Divorce Abolished"* writes with a high moral purpose, and is evidently a careful student of human nature. The treatise is not a long one—a matter of some eighty-four pages—and those who feel that the question is one of great social importance and desire light upon it might do well to study the suggestions here thrown out. The author has evidently some confidence in his own opinions, for he announces that the evil of marital unhappiness can be abolished by those who will follow out his instructions. He gives ten prevalent causes of disagreement in married life, beginning with the general ignorance of women in the conduct of households and ending with the fact that the balance of power in the household now rests in the hands of the husband. Among the other evils are the undue idealism with which young people enter married life, the interference of outsiders, habits of dissipation, and the failure to concede the wife's ownership of herself. Without following the treatise through the entire ten causes, we may say that the views and suggestions seem to us to be at times sensible and timely, and at other times rather wanting in these respects. So far as the influence of parents, especially mothers, is concerned, in training and instructing children for the future opening before them, the author cannot speak too strongly. There is a deplorable lack of even elementary instruction and discipline in those matters which are essential to the proper conduct of homes. As for vice and dissipation, these are unfortunately too often the accompaniments, not only of poverty, but also of wealth and luxurious living, and will probably continue so to be until the end of things. The most interesting part of the treatise, though perhaps the most obscure, is that in which the wife's ownership of herself is discussed. The author seems here to have hit upon a great discovery, and certainly discusses it with moderation and delicacy, but just what the discovery is, and how it is to keep married people from quarreling, we can hardly make out. What is apparently enjoined, is a kind of platonic rule of life in the married state, with exceptions after due and formal consent. Frankly, it seems to us that the author here gets out of his depth altogether. He thinks that if wives were absolutely free to choose, there would be no danger of large families. But it is to be doubted if large families bring about divorces. We rather think that the evil may lie in the opposite direction. Large families give parents something to think about, and when large families begin to be looked upon as a curse, divorces become frequent. The author writes some good things about improvident marriages among the young, but if young people will only lower their false standards of home life and be content with small things, they will solve a great deal of the difficulty for themselves. Perhaps

* "Divorce Abolished." Published by A. J. Palmer, Minneapolis.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it would be wise to forbid by law any marriage until both parties give some proof of being provident. Society may come to this in time. If a man could not legally marry until he had saved a few hundred dollars by his own honorable labor, there would probably be more manliness and less dandyism among our youth than at present. As to the balance of power question, what the author advances is entitled to consideration. The whole subject is vastly important, and must before long attract general attention, the evils of lax marriage laws, loose moral principles, and bad household management, with the ignorance, poverty and wretchedness following in the wake of imprudence and lust, being on the increase, notwithstanding the advance of civilization and the protests of moralists.

V.

THE ORIGIN AND NATURE OF THE BIBLE.

THERE can be no doubt that a gradual movement is in progress within the lines of Christian orthodoxy toward a better understanding of the Bible. Dr. Ladd, in this treatise,* holds steadfastly to the doctrine of Biblical authority and inspiration, but not in the old orthodox way. His work here avowedly covers about the same ground as his larger treatise on "The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture," but is designed for readers of less erudition and leisure. It is a very able and exhaustive book, and probably represents the views of modern Christian apologists, and will be accepted by many in the Church as on the whole an exposition and vindication of the faith. And yet the book is in itself a concession to the spirit of fearless inquiry and criticism to which the Scriptures have always been subjected. Dr. Ladd abandons some of the old positions as untenable. He has no sympathy with those who utter a cry of horror over every imputation of historical or scientific inaccuracy. He waives aside the theory of verbal inspiration as utterly indefensible. He admits that some of the books of the Bible are credited to men who did not write them, that some of the miracles recorded in the Bible may be very gravely doubted, and that not a few statements as to matters of fact—the traditions of Samson, for instance—may have been exaggerated by a species of poetic license. He concedes that "in the matter of genealogies, numbers, dates and sequence of time" it is "impossible to maintain the perfect accuracy of the writings of the Old and New Testaments" (page 223). He finds it needful to apologize for "the inferior moral and religous tone" of some parts of the Bible; and he, so to speak, "caps the climax" by asserting in plain words that inspiration as applied to human minds does not involve or guarantee infallibility of any kind, whether historical, linguistic, geographical, or ethical.

With all these admissions before us we may naturally be tempted to ask what there is left to mankind of the old-fashioned Bible; whether there be such a thing as infallible Scripture; and, if so, on what basis that doctrine can be said to rest? Dr. Ladd's view seems to us to be that the Bible—meaning the circuit of the canonical writings from Genesis to Revelation—cannot be looked upon as *being* the word of God, but simply as *containing* or embracing, and revealing that word; that this revelation is made to the conscience and to the spiritual faculty in man, and especially to those who, placing themselves in a proper spiritual and receptive attitude, are aided and influenced by the same spirit to receive and appropriate it. This, of course, is a prodigious claim to make in behalf of any book

* "What is the Bible?" An inquiry into the origin and nature of the Old and New Testaments in the light of modern Biblical study. By George T. Ladd, D. D., Professor of Divinity in the Yale University. Charles Scribner's Sons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or collection of books, conceded to be otherwise so full of errors; and many rationalistic minds will put it on one side as entirely presumptuous in the face of that admission. But it is quite possible to conceive of divine truth being conveyed to man through very imperfect media. It no doubt sorely tries the confidence of many in the Bible to find even the scholarship of the church rejecting it as an infallible authority on every subject on which it treats but one; but if we *must* prune away old beliefs it does not follow that we must cut down to the roots, and even tear up and destroy that which is *essential* and *vital* to belief.

This is evidently our author's view, and he seriously and skillfully sets himself the task of distinguishing between the essential purpose and authority of Scripture and the perverted ideas of men and theologians in regard thereto.

VI.

A HALF CENTURY OF SONG.*

WE have spent a delightful hour wandering discursively through the four attractive volumes of poetical selections which Mr. Henry F. Randolph has, with much industry and excellent taste, contributed to the literature of the current season. Mr. Randolph has made a very careful survey of the field, and few, if any, exceptions can be taken to either the names, the selections or the mode of classification. None but English poets are represented, and those only who have during the reign of Queen Victoria produced work worthy of their reputation, or have been poet laureates. The selections are sufficiently ample to convey a very fair idea of the peculiarities of each poet.

One cannot fail to be struck with the extent and variety of poetic talent under review. Rich, indeed, has the Victorian era been in works of genius. If no one name stands out with the pre-eminence of a Shakespeare or a Milton, there are scores of gifted men and women whose writings possess a wondrous charm, and the thought of grouping men together according to their poetic affinities and culling from each the choicest specimens of their life work is a peculiarly happy one.

A few names we miss which might perhaps be naturally expected to be found. George Eliot one would think entitled to a niche, and also the two Montgomerys. Certainly the author of the hymn beginning:

> Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,

ought not to be passed over in any enumeration of modern hymn-writers or distinctively religious poets of the past fifty years.

A capital feature of this work is the care bestowed upon the text, the selections being from the standard editions, and great attention having been given to the preservation of the original punctuation and orthography. Brief notes, biographical and bibliographical, precede the text in each volume, and at the end of each are full indexes, a list of the authors, and some useful and interesting explanatory notes.

VII.

A STORY WITH TWO AUTHORS.

THE plot of "The Second Son"† turns upon the weakness of an English squire, who petulantly disinherits the oldest of his three sons on the ground of a romantic love affair, and entails his landed estates upon his youngest son, because

* "Fifty Years of English Song." Selections from the Poets of the Reign of Victoria. Edited and arranged by Henry F. Randolph. A. D. F. Randolph & Co.

† "The Second Son." A novel. By M. O. W. Oliphant and T. B. Aldrich. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the second refuses to profit by the misfortunes of his elder brother. The peculiarities of the laws of primogeniture and entailment are brought out, although in this case they are not answerable for the mischief occasioned by a rash procedure on the part of the parent. The story has many strong points about it, especially if viewed as a satire upon the manners and customs of the English upper classes, or, indeed, the rich and luxurious classes everywhere. The authors seem to have agreed upon a pessimistic standpoint. There is not a hero or heroine in the whole novel worthy of the name. Even the villain of the story is a blundering guardsman who is as much fool as knave. As a picture of English life it is one-sided. The men and women are below the average in intellect as in manners. When father and sons meet there are always pitiful exhibitions of folly and rancour, with the thinnest gauze of good breeding to prevent actual breaches of the peace. There is something approaching imbecility in the amiable efforts of the injured brother to ward off the troubles continually brewing in the family. The ideal woman of the piece is a mere sketch and hardly awakens sympathy. There is a promise of character about Lily Ford, but at the critical moment she vanishes from sight, and when she again appears is evidently but a very commonplace personage after all. To us the work bears evidence of an overstraining at effect, and a consciousness of difficulty in the treatment. Either author would probably have written a better story if unencumbered by the assistance of the other.

VIII.

CARE AND CULTURE OF CHILDREN.

THE Woman's Temperance Association of Chicago publish a volume on the care and culture of childhood,* by Mary Allen West. The author claims that the book "has grown naturally out of the rich soil of a thousand homes," which being interpreted means that the author writes from experience and observation and not from mere theory. The contents are varied, including chapters on the child's body, babyhood, childhood, boyhood and girlhood, children's rights, work and play. amusements, behavior, domestic economy, family government, practical health hints, and other topics. There are also a number of illustrations, and, interspersed among the reading matter, are songs set to music, suitable for the nursery and the home. The book makes a large and handsome octavo of 722 pages, including a copious index. It is pervaded by strong Christian and temperance sentiment, the author holding that the growth in a child of a true and healthy religious and physical life is greatly to be desired and sought after, not only for its own sake, but for the general well being of society. On the various practical questions coming under treatment the views set forth are sound and sensible. The variety and range of topics almost invite the remark that some at least must suffer from superficial or backneyed treatment, but the author appears to have labored conscientiously and carefully over each section, and to have brought together many wise thoughts and counsels for the benefit of those who really desire guidance and help in the care and nurture of children. The subject is one of vast moment and deserves the exhaustive treatment it has here received.

IX.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls have added an interesting contribution to Shakespearian literature† in the form of a *fac-simile* of the original 1622 (sometimes

* "Childhood, its Care and Culture." By Mary Allen West. Woman's Temperance Publication Society.

† "The Works of William Shakespeare," in reduced *fac-simile*, from the famous first folio edition of 1623. Funks & Wagnalls.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

called 1623) folio edition, the only difference being that the size of the volume is reduced to a crown octavo. By the "new process," as it is called, photography lends its aid to the publisher and enables him practically to give to the million what has heretofore been the exclusive possession of the fortunate and wealthy few. Mr. Donnelly's theory that Lord Bacon was the real author of Shakepeare's works is founded largely upon a certain complex cipher which he thinks runs through this celebrated edition. Apart from this interesting speculation the folio edition has many attractions, being full, as the publishers state, of the most peculiar punctuation, bracketing, odd spelling, and the like. Taking *Hamlet's* soliloquy, we have

> The Oppressor's wrong, the *poore* man's contumely
> The pangs of *disprized* love—

and so in many other instances where in the modern editions the point of many a sentence or phrase is twisted. The typographical characters of this *fac-simile* are small, but with good eyes, or by the aid of a glass, the details of the famous folio edition are now at every one's disposal at a merely nominal price.

The anonymous author of "Miss Varian"* has studied fashionable life to some purpose, and has written a novel which deals with the vices and follies of a certain class of rich men with perfect candor and fidelity. "Society," as represented here, is a very disreputable affair, and perhaps it is well that the mirror should be held up to it, so that well meaning people who are hungering after its dissipations, ignorant of the dangers lurking within its borders, may be on their guard. The plot of this story hovers around the courtship and early matrimonial experiences of an innocent and beautiful girl, who weds an unprincipled man of pleasure, deeming him to be truth and virtue personified. The man is not wholly bad, however, and having come very near to being the indirect murderer of his wife, has the grace to repent of his sins and become all that a husband should be. Some very questionable characters are introduced to the reader in the course of the narrative, and a kind of lurid light is thrown upon some of the gayeties of our luxurious metropolis. There is a pretty fair representation of average society men and women, some good, some bad, and some neither one nor the other, making a picture not particularly elevating, but sure to attract attention.

Messrs. Lee and Shepard, of Boston, publish some beautiful volumes for the drawing-room table. Sir Walter Scott's "Bridal of Trierman," with fourteen full-plate illustrations, by Percy Macquoid, and sumptuously bound in cloth of gold, is one of the best of these. Similarly bound, but of quite a different character, is the charming collection of verses and wood engravings entitled "A Bunch of Violets," the verses collected by Irene E. Jerome, who has certainly shown rare diligence and judgment in her choice of subjects. The engravings are by George T. Andrew. This publishing house also sends us specimens of "Easter Hymns and Songs," delightfully illustrated and daintily enclosed in embossed covers with ribbon fastenings. The subject are "The Message of the Bluebird," illustrated by Irene E. Jerome; "Arise my soul, arise," by the author of "Nearer my God to Thee;" Charles Kingsley's sonnet "See the Land her Easter Keeping," and a pretty collection from the poets entitled "Gladness of Easter."

* "Miss Varian of New York." A Newport and New York society novel. By (?). W. Dillingham.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That Sterne was not to be the only sentimental traveler who was to make notes of his experiences, is proved by the appearance of this readable and modestly written book,* which records the actual adventures of a courageous couple on a tricycle tour. The mode of conveyance, the limited quantity of baggage "allowed," the exposure to all sorts of weather and to many inconveniences among strange people, and the numerous delays and obstacles incidental to this kind of a trip, combine to furnish materials for a good deal of delightful story telling. The lady appears to have been the Xenophon of the party, while the main conduct of the expedition was in charge of her sturdier half. We can promise the reader a great deal of entertainment. The book is profusely embellished with sketches, besides having a skeleton map showing the lines of travel.

The reader will naturally expect much when a new book for children† is announced from the pen of the author of "Little Lord Fauntleroy." *Sara Crewe* has been introduced to the circle of St. Nicholas readers during the past months, and juvenile critics have long ago pronounced her adventures almost as entertaining as those of the little lord. The story is briefer, and bears some marks of hasty composition; but there is the same delicacy and fascination in the chief character and the same beautiful child-likeness which constituted the charm of the companion volume, for the two will always be thought of in company. Sara is a brighter and more decided character than her noble brother, and her brave cheerfulness in the midst of very real trials as the drudge of Miss Minchin's boarding-school will win the heart of every reader who has a heart to be won.

That the child nature still has a healthy longing for purely imaginative tales is proved by the popularity of "Dreamland,"‡ a collection of modern fairy stories whose fourth edition has just been published. The author's fancy finds subjects in crocodiles and mermaids and in the smaller denizens of the deep, in magicians' caves and Oriental palaces, for these attractive sketches, which were first woven together to please a little invalid daughter, and which are just short enough and just bright enough to interest a child. The illustrations by Alfred Thompson are very numerous and are usually good.

The handsome volume containing the Second Series of W. Cushing's elaborate work on "Initials and Pseudonyms"§ bears the same marks of conscientious diligence as its predecessor. As many as 4,800 real names are referred to, the initials and pseudonyms being no less than 6,500. The work is in two parts, the second part giving an alphabetical list of authors with their *noms des plumes*, and in some instances, biographical notes.

The American Art Journal for April 14 is a special number, commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of that periodical. It contains a fine portrait of Henry C. Watson, its founder, and is otherwise beautifully illustrated.

*"Our Sentimental Journey through France and Italy." By Joseph and Elizabeth Robins Pennell. Longmans, Green & Co., New York.

†"Sara Crewe, or What Happened at Miss Minchin's." By Mrs. Frances Hodgson Burnett. Charles Scribner's Sons.

‡ "Dreamland; a Book of Modern Fairy Tales." By Charles Alfred Byrne. Illustrated by Alfred Thompson. Mook Bros. & Co.

§ "Initials and Pseudonyms." A dictionary of literary diagnosis. By William Cushing, B. A. T. Y. Crowell & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Chas. Scribner's Sons.

What is the Bible? An Inquiry into the Origin and Nature of the Old and New Testaments in the Light of Modern Biblical study. George T. Ladd, D.D.

Early Days of Mormonism. J. H. Kennedy.

The Century Co.

The Dusantes. Frank R. Stockton.

D. Appleton & Co.

The Case of Mohammed Benani. A Story of To-Day.

International Law. With Materials for a Code. Leone Levi, F.S.A., etc.

Cuppels and Hurd.

Life's Problems. Here and Hereafter. An Autobiography.

Cassell & Company.

William of Germany. A Succinct Biography of William I., German Emperor and King of Prussia. Archibald Forbes.

John Anderson & Co.

Plea for an American Language. Elias Molee, Ph.B.

Lee and Shepard.

Chips from a Teacher's Workshop. L. R. Klemm, Ph.D.

First Steps with American and British Authors. Albert F. Blaisdell, M.A.

The Seven Little Sisters who Live on the Round Ball that Floats in the Air. Jane Andrews.

The Flower People. Mrs. Horace Mann.

Britons and Muscovites; or Traits of Two Empires. Curtis Guild.

Charles L. Webster & Co.

A Biography of Henry Ward Beecher. By Wm. C. Beecher and Rev. S. Scoville, assisted by Mrs. Henry Ward Beecher.

Tenting on the Plains; or General Custer in Kansas and Texas. By Elizabeth B. Custer, Author of "Boots and Saddles."

A. R. Hart.

The Great Conspiracy: Its Origin and History. John A. Logan.

Armand Colin et Cie, Rue de Mézières, Paris.

Histoire de la Civilisation en France. Par Alfred Ramband.

The Writers' Publishing Company.

The Three Kingdoms: A Handbook of the Agassiz Association. Harlan H. Ballard, President A. A.

Silver, Rogers & Co.

Principles and Practice of Morality; or, Ethical Principles Discussed and Applied. E. G. Brown, D.D., LL.D., President of Brown University.

Longmans, Green & Co.

Our Sentimental Journey through France and Italy. Joseph and Elizabeth Robins Pennell.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

The Second Son. M. O. W. Oliphant and T. B. Aldrich.

Dodd, Mead & Co.

The Earth Trembled. Edward P. Roe.

D. Lothrop Company.

The Deathless Book. David O. Mears, D.D.

The Doctor of Deane. Mary T. Palmer.

Gorham Manufacturing Company.

Old Plate, Ecclesiastical, Decorative and Domestic: Its Makers and Marks. J. R. Buck.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED